

**HARVARD COLLEGE
LIBRARY**



**GIFT OF THE
GOVERNMENT
OF THE UNITED STATES**

INVESTIGATION OF THE AWARD BY
THE FUND FOR THE REPUBLIC, INC.
(PLYMOUTH MEETING, PA.)

HEARING
BEFORE THE
COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
EIGHTY-FOURTH CONGRESS
SECOND SESSION

JULY 18, 1956

Printed for the use of the Committee on Un-American Activities

(INCLUDING INDEX)



UNITED STATES
GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
WASHINGTON : 1956

83005

HARVARD COLLEGE LIBRARY
DEPOSITED BY THE
UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT

COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES

UNITED STATES HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FRANCIS E. WALTER, Pennsylvania, *Chairman*

MORGAN M. MOULDER, Missouri

CLYDE DOYLE, California

JAMES B. FRAZIER, JR., Tennessee

EDWIN E. WILLIS, Louisiana

HAROLD H. VELDE, Illinois

BERNARD W. KEARNEY, New York

DONALD L. JACKSON, California

GORDON H. SCHERER, Ohio

RICHARD ARENS, *Director*

CONTENTS

July 18, 1956: Testimony of—	Page
Maureen Black Ogden-----	5457
Afternoon Session:	
Isaac J. Sheppard-----	5484
Henry Hemsley-----	5494
Judge George C. Corson-----	5503
Emily Livezey Crawford-----	5510
Lillian Tapley (Mrs. Paul Tapley)-----	5514
Index-----	i

PUBLIC LAW 601, 79TH CONGRESS

The legislation under which the House Committee on Un-American Activities operates is Public Law 601, 79th Congress (1946), chapter 753, 2d session, which provides:

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, * * **

PART 2—RULES OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

RULE X

SEC. 121, STANDING COMMITTEES

* * * * *

17. Committee on Un-American Activities, to consist of nine members.

RULE XI

POWERS AND DUTIES OF COMMITTEES

* * * * *

(q) (1) Committee on Un-American Activities.

(A) Un-American Activities.

(2) The Committee on Un-American Activities, as a whole or by subcommittee, is authorized to make from time to time, investigations of (i) the extent, character, and objects of un-American propaganda activities in the United States, (ii) the diffusion within the United States of subversive and un-American propaganda that is instigated from foreign countries or of a domestic origin and attacks the principle of the form of government as guaranteed by our Constitution, and (iii) all other questions in relation thereto that would aid Congress in any necessary remedial legislation.

The Committee on Un-American Activities shall report to the House (or to the Clerk of the House if the House is not in session) the results of any such investigation, together with such recommendations as it deems advisable.

For the purpose of any such investigation, the Committee on Un-American Activities, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act at such times and places within the United States, whether or not the House is sitting, has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, to require the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, and to take such testimony, as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee or any subcommittee, or by any member designated by any such chairman, and may be served by any person designated by any such chairman or member.

RULES ADOPTED BY THE 84TH CONGRESS

House Resolution 5, January 5, 1955

* * * * *

RULE X

STANDING COMMITTEES

1. There shall be elected by the House, at the commencement of each Congress :

* * * * *

(q) Committee on Un-American Activities, to consist of nine members.

* * * * *

RULE XI

POWERS AND DUTIES OF COMMITTEES

* * * * *

17. Committee on Un-American Activities.

(a) Un-American Activities.

(b) The Committee on Un-American Activities, as a whole or by subcommittee, is authorized to make from time to time, investigations of (1) the extent, character, and objects of un-American propaganda activities in the United States, (2) the diffusion within the United States of subversive and un-American propaganda that is instigated from foreign countries or of a domestic origin and attacks the principle of the form of government as guaranteed by our Constitution, and (3) all other questions in relation thereto that would aid Congress in any necessary remedial legislation.

The Committee on Un-American Activities shall report to the House (or to the Clerk of the House if the House is not in session) the results of any such investigation, together with such recommendations as it deems advisable.

For the purpose of any such investigation, the Committee on Un-American Activities, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act at such times and places within the United States, whether or not the House is sitting, has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, to require the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, and to take such testimony, as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee or any subcommittee, or by any member designated by any such chairman, and may be served by any person designated by any such chairman or member.

**INVESTIGATION OF THE AWARD BY THE FUND FOR
THE REPUBLIC, INC.
(Plymouth Meeting, Pa.)**

WEDNESDAY, JULY 18, 1956

**UNITED STATES HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE
COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES,
Philadelphia, Pa.
PUBLIC HEARING**

A subcommittee of the Committee on Un-American Activities met, pursuant to recess, in District Court Room No. 5, United States Court-house, Philadelphia, Pa., Hon. Francis E. Walter, chairman, presiding.

Committee members present: Representatives Francis E. Walter, of Pennsylvania, and Gordon H. Scherer, of Ohio.

Staff members present: Richard Arens, director, W. Jackson Jones, K. Baarslag, Richard S. Weil, and Mrs. Dolores Scotti.

The CHAIRMAN. The committee will be in order.

The committee wishes to examine another aspect in connection with the activity of the Fund for the Republic, whose largess in this instance has reached into the Philadelphia area. The committee wishes to know more about the factors which prompted the Fund for the Republic to consider the retention of a Communist, a defense of "democratic principles" worth \$5,000 of its tax-exempt money.

The Communists and their dupes will undoubtedly try to distort our inquiry into appearing as an interference with the great freedom of religion. I want to emphasize at this time that the committee is not interested in inquiring into any of the activities of a religious organization. Our sole concern is with the seemingly dubious ventures of the Fund for the Republic, Inc.

Call your witness, Mr. Arens.

Mr. ARENS. Miss Maureen Black, please come forward.

Kindly remain standing while the chairman administers an oath.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you swear that the testimony you are to give will be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

Mrs. OGDEN. I do.

**TESTIMONY OF MRS. MAUREEN BLACK OGDEN, ACCOMPANIED BY
COUNSEL, BETHUEL M. WEBSTER**

Mr. ARENS. Please identify yourself by name, residence, and occupation.

Mrs. OGDEN. Maureen Black Ogden—I have gotten married since you issued the subpoena—59 Lakeview Avenue, Shorthills, N. Y., researcher for the Fund for the Republic.

Mr. ARENS. Are you appearing today in response to a subpoena by the House Committee on Un-American Activities?

Mrs. OGDEN. I am.

Mr. ARENS. Are you represented by counsel?

Mrs. OGDEN. Yes; I am.

Mr. ARENS. Will counsel kindly identify himself.

Mr. WEBSTER. My name is Bethuel M. Webster. I am a lawyer, a member of the New York bar. I am counsel to the Fund for the Republic. I am also counsel to Mrs. Ogden.

Just a minute, please. You asked me to identify myself.

Mr. ARENS. To identify yourself; yes.

Mr. WEBSTER. I am also counsel to Mrs. William E. Stevenson, a director of the Fund for the Republic, who is here, has come here from Mexico City, for the purpose of telling the facts about the Plymouth Meeting Award.

I request, Mr. Chairman, an opportunity for her to be heard.

The CHAIRMAN. We will hear Mrs. Stevenson in due course, but it doesn't fit into the program arranged for today. I understand that the House of Representatives will vote tomorrow on a very important bill, and Mr. Scherer and I are both anxious to be recorded. So these hearings will be terminated this afternoon and we will give Mrs. Stevenson, as I told you, I think on three occasions, an opportunity to be heard.

Mr. WEBSTER. Mr. Chairman, I want to apologize for raising my voice a moment ago. It is not my habit to raise my voice. I did so only because there was a good deal of noise in the room.

Mrs. Stevenson is a responsible person. She is the director—

The CHAIRMAN. I don't doubt that for a moment.

Mr. WEBSTER. I want to explain in connection with my representation of Mrs. Ogden that Mrs. Ogden is a respected and valued employee—

The CHAIRMAN. You don't have to explain.

Mr. WEBSTER. But she is not—

The CHAIRMAN. No lawyer ever explains representing a client.

Mr. WEBSTER. The board of the Fund made this award, Mr. Chairman, and I respectfully implore you to hear Mrs. Stevenson today.

The CHAIRMAN. No; we will be unable to hear her today because it doesn't fit into the program, Mr. Webster. We are going to conduct this according to our plans, and that does not fit into the plans.

Mr. WEBSTER. Mr. Chairman, as you know, we have repeatedly asked for an opportunity, an equal opportunity, to be heard.

The CHAIRMAN. And I have told you repeatedly, and I told directors of the Fund repeatedly, that they are going to be heard.

Mr. WEBSTER. But you have only called—

The CHAIRMAN. We are conducting this inquiry our way.

Mr. WEBSTER. I understand that you are, sir; but I implore you to give the witnesses for the Fund for the Republic, the board and the officers, an opportunity to be heard.

The CHAIRMAN. I will be delighted to, and I am sure that some of them have already talked to me about being heard, and we are talking about arrangements for them.

Proceed, Mr. Arens.

MR. ARENS. Mrs. Ogden, you are an employee of the Fund for the Republic. That is clear on this record; is it not?

MRS. OGDEN. That is correct.

MR. ARENS. The subpoena which was served upon you is a subpoena duces tecum, as we say in the law, requiring you to produce certain documents. Do you have in your custody and control the documents which were referred to in the subpoena?

MRS. OGDEN. No; I do not.

MR. ARENS. Where are those documents?

MR. WEBSTER. Mr. Chairman——

THE CHAIRMAN. You advise your client, Mr. Webster.

MR. ARENS. Kindly tell us where those documents are, those referred to in the subpoena.

MR. WEBSTER. As far as you know, I have them.

MRS. OGDEN. I believe Mr. Webster has them because I have no legal responsibility for them.

MR. ARENS. Did you have those documents at the time the subpoena was served upon you?

MRS. OGDEN. No, I don't have any control of the documents.

MR. WEBSTER. Mr. Chairman, I must explain——

THE CHAIRMAN. Mr. Webster, please sit down.

MR. WEBSTER. Mr. Chairman——

THE CHAIRMAN. Will you please sit down?

MR. WEBSTER. I have the documents here, Mr. Chairman.

THE CHAIRMAN. Let Mr. Arens conduct this examination.

MR. WEBSTER. Mrs. Ogden is not the secretary of the Fund for the Republic. She is not an officer of the Fund for the Republic.

THE CHAIRMAN. We will develop all that. Proceed, Mr. Arens.

MR. WEBSTER. I have not only given Mr. Arens all the information he has asked for—I have now produced the documents.

THE CHAIRMAN. All right, fine.

MR. WEBSTER. Mrs. Ogden is not in possession of the documents, Mr. Chairman.

THE CHAIRMAN. Please give them to her.

MR. ARENS. If you will kindly restrain yourself I will interrogate the witness.

MR. WEBSTER. She is not authorized to deal with these documents for the Fund for the Republic.

MR. ARENS. Mrs. Ogden, did you yourself prepare certain of these documents which are referred to in the subpoena duces tecum?

MRS. OGDEN. I prepared a report after a trip down to Plymouth Meeting and examining other documents; that is right.

MR. ARENS. To whom did you submit those documents?

MRS. OGDEN. I submitted my report to David F. Freeman, who was then secretary of the Fund for the Republic.

MR. WEBSTER. Mr. Chairman, may I submit a copy of the report that Mr. Arens just asked about.

THE CHAIRMAN. No; we will get around to that.

MR. ARENS. We will develop that in due course, Mr. Webster. Kindly restrain yourself.

MR. WEBSTER. Mr. Arens, I hope I am restrained.

Mr. ARENS. Mrs. Ogden, what other documents did you have in your custody and control other than the report which you prepared?

Mrs. OGDEN. I saw Mr. Sprogell's memorandum. I was given Mr. Sprogell's memorandum and told to read it and go down to Plymouth Meeting and check the veracity of it, which I did.

Mr. WEBSTER. Mr. Arens, I am sure you don't mind—

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Webster, in a court of law, if I did what you are doing here now, I would be fined for contempt of court. Now please sit down.

Mr. WEBSTER. In a court of law, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. You have been in the practice of the law long enough to know just exactly proper courtroom deportment.

Mr. WEBSTER. This is not a courtroom.

The CHAIRMAN. I know that.

Mr. WEBSTER. I regret to say this is not a courtroom. The documents referred to were submitted to you weeks ago.

Mr. ARENS. Mrs. Ogden, would you kindly tell the committee whether or not you have caused to be transmitted to your counsel any of the documents which were in your custody and control and alluded to in the subpoena?

Mrs. OGDEN. I don't have to transmit them because they never were in my custody and control, because, as I understand it, when I submitted the report to Mr. Freeman it then became a Fund document, and I am not the secretary of the Fund for the Republic.

The CHAIRMAN. Does your counsel to your knowledge have in his possession this morning the documents called for in the subpoena duces tecum?

Mrs. OGDEN. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Will counsel kindly produce the documents?

Mr. WEBSTER. Mr. Chairman, as counsel for the Fund, I produce the papers called for in the subpoena duces tecum served on Mrs. Ogden.

The CHAIRMAN. I think the record will show that without your stating it.

Mr. WEBSTER. It won't do any harm to say it again.

The CHAIRMAN. I know.

Mr. ARENS. Thank you, sir.

How do you spell your name, Mrs. Ogden?

Mrs. OGDEN. O-g-d-e-n.

Mr. ARENS. Give us, if you please, a brief sketch of your educational background.

Mrs. OGDEN. I was graduated from Kent Place School in Summit, N. J., in 1946, from Smith College with a bachelor of arts in 1950.

Mr. ARENS. Did that complete your formal education?

Mrs. OGDEN. Yes.

Mr. ARENS. Kindly tell us of your employment record since completion of your formal education.

Mrs. OGDEN. I started working at the Ford Foundation in either January or February of 1951. I went to work for the Fund for the Republic May 1, 1953, on a 1-year leave of absence from the Ford Foundation and in 1954 I assumed that my employment with the Fund for the Republic became permanent.

Mr. ARENS. Were you assigned to investigate the facts surrounding the employment of Mary Knowles as a librarian in the William Jeanes Memorial Library at Plymouth Meeting, Pa.?

Mrs. OGDEN. No; I wasn't supposed to investigate the facts concerning her employment. I was supposed to investigate the story as presented in Harry Sprogell's memorandum of—what is the date, Mr. Webster? I think we received it in April of 1955. There isn't any date on it.

Mr. ARENS. I lay before you, please, the document entitled "Memorandum: Plymouth Monthly Meeting," and ask you if that is the Sprogell memorandum or document to which you have just alluded.

Mr. WEBSTER. We have a copy of that.

Mrs. OGDEN. Yes; it certainly seems to be.

Mr. WEBSTER. Just a moment. I just want to be sure. There are some pencil notes, Mr. Chairman, on this and I just want to know whether or not Mr. Arens has asked Mrs. Ogden to identify those notes as well as the typewritten document.

The CHAIRMAN. Proceed, Mr. Arens.

Mr. WEBSTER. May I ask if the notes—

Mrs. OGDEN. I don't believe those are my notes. Those are not my handwriting.

Mr. WEBSTER. The witness says those are not her notes, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. ARENS. Will you kindly tell the committee just what were your specific instructions?

Mrs. OGDEN. I was given this memorandum by Mr. Sprogell—

Mr. ARENS. Pardon the interruption. When was that, please?

Mrs. OGDEN. I guess it was the last week of April of 1955, because I went to Plymouth Meeting on May 2, 1955. I was told to go down to Plymouth Meeting and to check this memorandum and see that it correctly stated the case.

Mr. ARENS. To check whether or not the memorandum, the Sprogell memorandum, we will call it, correctly stated the facts?

Mrs. OGDEN. That is correct.

Mr. ARENS. Mr. Chairman, I respectfully suggest that this Sprogell memorandum, which has been identified by Mrs. Ogden, be marked "Ogden Exhibit No. 1" and incorporated in the record.

The CHAIRMAN. Mark it and incorporate it in its entirety in the body of this record.

OGDEN EXHIBIT No. 1

SPROGELL MEMORANDUM: PLYMOUTH MONTHLY MEETING

Plymouth Monthly Meeting, located at Plymouth Meeting, Pa., is one of the constituent bodies of Philadelphia Yearly Meeting of Friends commonly called Quakers. The Meeting is in a situation of a conspicuous target of public criticism and of potential serious financial embarrassment because it has taken and maintained a position likely to encourage civil liberty.

Some 20 years ago the Meeting was the recipient of a bequest of considerable size to establish and maintain a free public library. With part of the money a small library building was erected on the Meeting grounds; an endowment was created with the remainder. The care of the library was entrusted to a committee of members appointed annually by the Meeting.

During the late years of the depression the endowment fund shrank substantially and it became necessary to find other annual funds if the library was to be preserved. This was done in two ways: An organization known as Friends of the Jeanes Library (the benefactor had been named Jeanes) was formed and funds were obtained by annual appropriation from Plymouth Township (the local governmental unit) and Whitemarsh Township adjoining. Each of these contributed \$500 annually and the School Districts of Plymouth and Whitemarsh

Townships each contributed \$200 annually. As a condition to obtaining public funds two representatives designated by the Supervisors of Plymouth Township were added to the committee.

In 1953 the Library Committee, seeking a temporary librarian because of illness of its permanent employee, received an application from Mary Knowles, a fully qualified librarian. Mrs. Knowles had been a secretary at the Samuel Adams School in the suburbs of Boston from 1945 to 1947. She had then taken employment as librarian in a Massachusetts community. While she was employed there Herbert Philbrick gave testimony concerning her before the Jenner Committee. It is generally assumed that he testified that she had been a member of the Communist Party while at the Samuel Adams School. The governing body of the Library where Mrs. Knowles was employed asked the Jenner Committee to call her before it to "clear her name," but when she was summoned to a public hearing she declined answering questions, pleading the Fifth Amendment. She also declined a loyalty oath which was required of her by Massachusetts law. She was thereupon fired, it is believed in about 1952, and was unable to obtain employment elsewhere because she disclosed these facts frankly to all prospective employers.

When she applied to the Meeting, disclosing these facts as was her custom, the Meeting conducted a careful investigation into her conduct since 1947, obtained from her a written statement that she had not been a member of any subversive organization since 1947 (she also gave this statement later in notarized form), found that she was a fully qualified librarian whose conduct had been irreproachable since 1947, concluded that such a person should not be denied the opportunity of rehabilitation, and hired her. Her employment has since been made permanent.

Ever since that time the Meeting has been the object of repeated onslaughts by a small determined group in the community whose object is to compel the Meeting to dismiss Mrs. Knowles. One of the public representatives on the committee first tendered Mrs. Knowles a Pennsylvania loyalty oath which she declined and then arranged to have discontinued the contribution by the Plymouth Supervisors. The Whitemarsh appropriation due in July 1954, was paid before the uproar began but it is expected will not be renewed. The School Directors of Plymouth and Whitemarsh Townships have withdrawn all school children from using the library (classes have visited the library in the past for instruction in the use of reference works) and it is supposed will not renew their contributions. The estimated annual loss from these sources will be \$1,400.

An energetic member of the community has formed a de facto organization called "Americans Alerted" and has deluged the community with press releases, mimeographed mailing pieces, subscriptions to Facts Forum and the American Mercury, reprints from those magazines and private letters in great volume. She has arranged to have the American Legion and the DAR pass resolutions requesting the removal of the librarian. She has presented petitions to the Meeting asking that the librarian be removed. She has urged members of the community to dissociate themselves from Friends of the Jeanes Library Association in order to put economic pressure upon the Meeting. Her latest attack upon the problem is to attempt to persuade the community that the librarian's incumbency is not the choice of the Meeting itself but of certain willful members of the Library Committee who are assertedly forcing their will upon the other members—in short the present form of her effort is to disunite the Meeting itself.

Actually, the circulation of the library has increased largely but there has been some falling off of contributions and the Meeting and its committee are somewhat at a loss to know how the operation of the library is to be continued. Neither is it entirely certain at the moment whether the issue of the librarian's continuing is fully settled. There are some members of the Meeting who have supported the Committee's stand on principle but if this stand should cause the closing of the library because of shortage of funds it is conceivable that these members might take the position that the principles involved in keeping the library open to the public were more important than the principles involved in rehabilitating an individual suspected by some in the community.

A file of the newspaper articles, mimeographed releases and letters to the editor which have appeared can be made available for inspection. The Meeting has defended its position clearly and with dignity taking the stand that the librarian is entitled to be judged on her loyalty by her actions and present

declarations and not by past association nor by any specific test such as an elaborate loyalty oath. The attacks upon this position have become steadily more intemperate and are being directed more and more at the Meeting itself and at certain of its members.

Mr. ARENS. Were you given any specific instruction in addition to the instruction you have just stated, that you were to check on the accuracy of the facts portrayed in Ogden Exhibit No. 1?

Mrs. OGDEN. Specific instructions from whom? You mean someone in the Fund?

Mr. ARENS. Who gave you your instructions in the Fund?

Mrs. OGDEN. David Freeman.

Mr. ARENS. Was he your immediate superior in the Fund?

Mrs. OGDEN. That is right.

Mr. ARENS. What position did he occupy?

Mrs. OGDEN. He was then the secretary of the Fund.

Mr. ARENS. Kindly tell the committee, in your own words, what you did after you received your instructions from the Fund.

Mrs. OGDEN. In addition to the instructions from Mr. Freeman he had received a letter from Mr. M. Albert Linton, who is a director of the Fund for the Republic, chairman of the board of the Provident Mutual Life Insurance, suggesting that when someone went down to Plymouth Meeting to check on this memorandum, they speak to John Archibald, Irvin Poley, of the Germantown Friends School, and Fred Gloeckner. So I called up Mr. Poley and he said I should certainly see John Archibald who was the Clerk of the Meeting. He said—I believe it was he who said—"Don't bother to go see Mr. Gloeckner because he would only tell you the side of the library committee more enthusiastically than most." He said to see a Mr. Evans in a law firm in Philadelphia because one of his associates had made an impartial study of the case, and this associate was Mr. Philip Bregy; only it developed he had not made the impartial study.

Mr. ARENS. How many days?

Mrs. OGDEN. He hadn't made any.

Mr. ARENS. How many days?

Mr. WEBSTER. Did you get that correction?

Mrs. OGDEN. Before I went down—

Mr. ARENS. Excuse me. You go right ahead.

Mrs. OGDEN. I also talked to Richard Bennett, of the community relations program of the American Friends Service Committee. I believe he lives near Plymouth Meeting. He told me what he knew of the situation. I also spoke to Frank Loescher, who attends the Friends meeting at the city of Radnor, Pa., because he was a consultant to the Fund for the Republic. However, he didn't have anything further to add to the memorandum of Mr. Sproggell.

Mr. ARENS. May I interrupt to clear the record? Are these conversations you are recounting now, conversations which transpired prior to the time that you actually arrived?

Mrs. OGDEN. Prior to my going to Plymouth Meeting.

Mr. ARENS. Proceed, if you please.

Mrs. OGDEN. So when I went down first to Philadelphia on Monday, May 2, 1955, I spoke to Mr. Bregy, who was the one who was supposed to have made an impartial study but had not made any study at all, and he told me that he knew people on both sides of the dispute but that he had written a letter to the library committee to say he was

thoroughly in agreement with their stand and that 9 out of 10 people in Plymouth Meeting felt as he did.

Then after I left Mr. Bregy's office I went to see Mr. Sprogell because he was the author of the memorandum. He is a Philadelphia lawyer. After that I went out to Plymouth Meeting, and I spoke for several hours with Mrs. Mary Chapple, who is one of the members of the library committee.

Mr. ARENS. You have now arrived at Plymouth Meeting.

Mrs. OGDEN. Yes.

Mr. ARENS. May I interrupt for a moment the sequence of your recitation. How much time did you spend in the Plymouth Meeting area in the course of your investigation?

Mrs. OGDEN. I actually spent 1 day. However, when I left Plymouth Meeting I took with me a complete file which the library committee had, which contained all the mimeographed statements that had been sent out to the community by Alerted Americans, Mrs. Corson's group. It contained all the newspaper articles, specifically a series I think of five articles in the Conshohocken Recorder which contained interviews with people who were against Mrs. Knowles' being retained as the librarian.

Mr. ARENS. Did you, in the course of your investigation at Plymouth Meeting, have access to the minutes of the library committee?

Mrs. OGDEN. I believe—no, not all the minutes. I believe that they gave me the minutes pertinent to Mrs. Knowles' employment.

Mr. ARENS. Did you have access to the minutes of the Plymouth Monthly Meeting itself, as distinguished from the library committee?

Mrs. OGDEN. No. As I just said, I don't know. I don't believe I ever saw all those minutes. I was just interested in seeing the excerpts of the minutes which concerned Mrs. Knowles and the library committee's stand on her employment.

Mr. ARENS. Tell us with whom you actually conferred, or interviewed during your investigation.

Mrs. OGDEN. You mean in Plymouth Meeting?

Mr. ARENS. Yes.

Mrs. OGDEN. I actually talked for several hours to Mrs. Mary Chapple, who is a member of the library committee, Mrs. Lillian Tapley, who is the chairman of the library committee, Mr. John Archibald, the clerk. I talked for a couple of minutes to Mrs. Knowles. I spoke to Miss Ambler. I called up Mrs. Corson because I wanted to make an appointment with her. She said she couldn't see me that day. I believe she said she couldn't see me the next day. She couldn't see me for several days, she said. So I asked her if she wanted to make a statement about her position, and she said that her organization, Alerted Americans, which had approximately 30 people in it—

Mr. ARENS. This is Mrs. Corson speaking?

Mrs. OGDEN. This is Mrs. Corson.

Had no desire to persecute Mrs. Knowles but she was a security risk as defined by President Eisenhower and that she was in a position—

Mr. WEBSTER. I don't believe the chairman is hearing this.

Mrs. OGDEN. And that she was in a position to do harm if she wanted to, in a sensitive position to do harm if she wished to.

Mr. ARENS. Did you see Dr. Gloeckner? Did you talk to her?

Mrs. OGDEN. No, I didn't.

Fred Gloeckner, I believe is her husband and is the one suggested by Mr. Linton.

Mr. ARENS. Did you speak to any one, by telephone other than with Mrs. Corson, who was hostile to Mrs. Knowles?

Mrs. OGDEN. No. I asked Mrs. Corson who I should see to represent her case. I asked her if I should see Mrs. Cooper—I think her name is Mrs. Cooper—who I understood was Mrs. Corson's lieutenant. But she said no; she said see Mrs. Sawyer, who was the ex-librarian.

Mr. ARENS. Did you see or was there displayed to you the letter from Isaac Sheppard in which he resigned from the library committee after 33 years' service?

Mrs. OGDEN. I don't remember whether I saw that letter or not, because——

Mr. ARENS. Did you ascertain the number of people who were opposed to Mary Knowles' retention?

Mrs. OGDEN. You mean in the library?

Mr. ARENS. In your investigation did you ascertain the proportionate number of people at Plymouth Meeting who were opposed to Mary Knowles?

Mrs. OGDEN. When you say "Plymouth Meeting," do you mean Plymouth Monthly Meeting or Plymouth Meeting, the community?

Mr. ARENS. Either one or both. Let's take them both.

Mr. WEBSTER. Is your question the proportion or the number?

Mr. ARENS. Did you ascertain the number or proportion of people at Plymouth Monthly Meeting who had evidenced a disapproval of the retention of Mary Knowles as librarian?

Mrs. OGDEN. I knew that there were some people in the Monthly Meeting of the Society of Friends, and I gathered from my talks with Mrs. Chapple and Mrs. Tapley that it was about half a dozen, or 10, or 12 people.

Mr. ARENS. As a matter of fact, over 22 people at the Plymouth Monthly Meeting had signed a petition protesting the retention of Mary Knowles. Isn't that correct?

Mrs. OGDEN. Well, I think here we were talking about active members. You see, there is a great difference between people who come to regular meetings and those who are members of the Meeting and might not even live in Plymouth Meeting any more, who sign petitions, as I understand it.

Mr. ARENS. Did you ascertain that a petition with 600 names had been submitted, of which 22 were members of the Plymouth Monthly Meeting of the Religious Society of Friends, protesting the retention of Mary Knowles?

Mrs. OGDEN. I believe that I read in the mimeographed statement of Mrs. Corson's that she had collected a petition in the community of approximately 458 names. I don't know that it said how many members of Plymouth Monthly Meeting, Quaker group, were on that petition.

Mr. ARENS. Among these newspaper articles which I understood you to say you took back with you in the course of your investigation, did you take back with you the article of the Conshohocken—I may not be pronouncing that correctly—Recorder of March 31, 1955—

Mr. WEBSTER. The chairman will help you pronounce that.

Mr. ARENS. In which there is set forth an article entitled "463 Sign Petition Urging Replacement of Librarian."

Mrs. OGDEN. That is probably where I got——

Mr. ARENS. I lay this article before the witness. I ask if you actually took that newspaper article back with you.

Mr. WEBSTER. You don't mind my looking at it, too; do you?

Mrs. OGDEN. I assume that this is——

Mr. WEBSTER. Examine it.

Mrs. OGDEN. I will tell you first, Mr. Arens, that this material that I had was extremely voluminous, and it took me more than a day to read through it. I haven't read through it since May of 1955:

The CHAIRMAN. May I interrupt at this point. You said you examined the pertinent minutes of the meeting. What do you mean by the pertinent minutes?

Mr. OGDEN. I don't think I said pertinent minutes. I think I said——

The CHAIRMAN. I wrote it down.

Mrs. OGDEN. I said pertinent excerpts from the minutes which the library committee gave me.

Mr. ARENS. Did you take back with you the newspaper article from the Conshohocken Recorder of March 31, 1955, entitled "463 Sign Petitions Urging Replacement of Librarian"? Did you take that back with you?

Mr. WEBSTER. Mr. Chairman, I want to be sure the record is right on this. She said she saw pertinent extracts of the minutes relating only to the case of Mrs. Knowles.

The CHAIRMAN. Right. That is what this committee attempted to subpoena, and then we were charged with attempting to violate some provision of the Constitution.

Mr. ARENS. Would you kindly tell us whether or not you actually took back with you and reported to the Fund for the Republic, among those newspaper clippings that you took, that article indicating that 463 had signed a petition urging the replacement of Mary Knowles in the library?

Mrs. OGDEN. Shall I read it over?

Mr. ARENS. If you have a recollection of it, tell us. If you don't have a recollection of it, I would appreciate your just saying you don't have a recollection.

Mrs. OGDEN. As I answered a question, a few questions back, I said I thought it was around 460 people that Mrs. Corson had on her petition from the community of Plymouth Meeting, so I assume that I either got it from the article which is headlined that way or else I got it from a mimeographed statement of Mrs. Corson's.

Mr. ARENS. Did you take back with you the article from the Ambler Gazette of March 31, 1955, "468 Ask Library Committee to Discharge Mrs. Knowles as William Jeanes Librarian"? Did you take that back with you?

Mrs. OGDEN. I just can't be sure about these articles, Mr. Arens. I mean, there were so many.

Mr. ARENS. I can appreciate you might have difficulty recollecting the particular article, but do you recall that you took back articles of this nature?

Mrs. OGDEN. Yes; surely. Of course.

Mr. ARENS. Now I lay before you another article from this same publication, the Conshohocken Recorder of Thursday, December 23,

in which the headline reads: "Sheppard Brothers and Henry Hemsley Reiterate Their Specific Reasons for Resigning as Friends Library Officials."

Did you take back articles from the newspapers indicating the resignation of those gentlemen from the library committee and the recitation of their reasons?

Mrs. OGDEN. I am not sure about this specific article, but I know I was aware of why they resigned and that they had resigned and what their stands were.

Mr. ARENS. Kindly tell the committee, if you please, those you interviewed in the area who were hostile to the retention of Mary Knowles as librarian besides the person with whom you talked on the telephone, namely, Mrs. Corson.

Mrs. OGDEN. As I said, in my conversation with Mrs. Corson she didn't want me to see Mrs. Cooper, if that is that woman's name, and I believe it is. She suggested that I see Mrs. Sawyer. I felt from Mrs. Sawyer I would get an opinion and that I was interested in getting the facts. My thought when I left Plymouth Meeting at the end of being there 1 day was that I would go back to the Fund for the Republic and read all the material that I was taking with me, the complete file, and if I had any further questions I would come back to Plymouth Meeting to ask them of the proper persons or else, if the officers had any questions of me, they would direct me to come back.

Mr. ARENS. All of those you interviewed in the Plymouth Meeting area, with the exception of Mrs. Corson, were favorable to the retention of Mary Knowles in the library; were they not?

(The witness conferred with her counsel.)

Mrs. OGDEN. The answer to that is "Yes." However, in my judgment I obtained all the facts I needed to verify Mr. Sprogell's memorandum, which was my job in going to Plymouth Meeting.

Mr. ARENS. Did you have suggested to you the possibility of interviewing Isaac Sheppard?

Mrs. OGDEN. Who do you think—I mean who——

Mr. ARENS. Isaac Sheppard, who is a lifelong member of the Plymouth Meeting, a leading citizen of the community.

Mrs. OGDEN. I know who he is. Who are you inferring should have suggested that I see him?

Mr. ARENS. I was wondering if it was suggested to you in view of the investigation that you made, suggested by anyone, that you go see Isaac Sheppard, one of the prominent members of the community, because he might shed some illuminating light on the Mary Knowles matter.

Mrs. OGDEN. No; I don't recall anyone telling me that. However, in my report I state Mr. Sheppard's position and his resignation from the library committee.

Mr. ARENS. Did you ascertain that most of the people in the Plymouth Monthly Meeting who registered their views were in opposition to the retention of Mary Knowles in the library? Did you register that in your report? I haven't, of course, had an opportunity to see your report because your counsel just now produced it.

(The witness conferred with her counsel.)

Mrs. OGDEN. Are you talking——

Mr. WEBSTER. By the way, facts are stated on page 4 of this report, if the chairman wishes to follow it.

Mrs. OGDEN. Could you repeat the question, please?

Mr. ARENS. When you made your own report, which you submitted to the Fund for the Republic checking on the accuracy of the Sprogell memorandum, identified as Ogden Exhibit No. 1, did you in that report tell the Fund for the Republic that most of the people in the Plymouth Monthly Meeting who registered an opinion on the retention of Mary Knowles were opposed to the retention of Mary Knowles as librarian?

Mrs. OGDEN. No. I said that there were some people who were against it, but it is not my knowledge to this day that most of the people were.

Mr. ARENS. It is your position as of this day that most of the people in the Plymouth Monthly Meeting who registered a view on the retention of Mary Knowles were favorable to the retention of Mary Knowles. Is that correct?

Mrs. OGDEN. In October of 1954, the October 19 meeting, the members present at that meeting unanimously agreed with the library committee's employment of Mrs. Knowles, no opposition, and made her permanent.

Mr. ARENS. Is that the temporary employment?

Mrs. OGDEN. That is permanent employment.

Mr. ARENS. Did you report that? Is that part of the report you made to the Fund for the Republic?

Mrs. OGDEN. Yes.

Mr. ARENS. I want this record to be absolutely clear on this. Is it your position now and was it your position in the submission of your report that most of the folks in the Plymouth Monthly Meeting, who registered a view on the retention of Mary Knowles, were favorable to the retention of Mary Knowles in a permanent capacity?

Mr. WEBSTER. Just to be fair about it——

Mr. ARENS. Would you kindly answer the question, Mrs. Ogden?

Mr. WEBSTER. May I ask, Mr. Chairman, if he is referring to the meeting of the congregation or the parish or is he referring to the community?

The CHAIRMAN. The question is very clear.

Mr. WEBSTER. Some of these questions relate to the community.

Mr. ARENS. To the congregation.

Mrs. OGDEN. How do you mean people who registered an opinion? Do you mean actually in writing, wrote a letter, or spoke to people?

Mr. ARENS. Tell us in your own words. I may be confusing you here. I don't intend to, I assure you. What did you say to the Fund for the Republic as to the attitude or position of the people in the congregation toward the retention of Mary Knowles as librarian? In essence what did you say to the Fund for the Republic?

Mrs. OGDEN. I said that the Meeting had taken unanimous action to make her employment permanent in October of 1954, and that it was my knowledge that the majority of the Meeting when I went there in May of 1955 was still in favor of the movement of Mrs. Knowles, that there was some dissent but that it was certainly very much in the minority.

Mr. ARENS. I lay before you a document entitled "Citizens for Philbrick, Plymouth Meeting, Pa.," dated February 15, 1955, beginning at least in this respect:

Accompanying this letter are the signatures of 243 patriotic Americans who request that you replace the present librarian at the Jeanes Library.

addressed To The Society of Friends, Plymouth Meeting, Pa., submitted by Mrs. Philip L. Corson. I ask you now, if you please, whether or not you took that document or the information from that document back to the Fund for the Republic.

(The witness conferred with her counsel.)

Mrs. OGDEN. Of course when I wrote my report I said that there weren't 245. I said 468 or whatever the number was. Again this is a question of the community itself and not the Meeting.

Mr. ARENS. Did you know, that that particular petition containing 243 names was presented to the Plymouth Monthly Meeting of the Religious Society of Friends by Judge George C. Corson?

(The witness conferred with her counsel.)

Mrs. OGDEN. Mrs. Corson sent out an awful lot of papers that looked very similar to that.

Mr. ARENS. Did you report to the Fund for the Republic either by taking back a sample copy of this petition or by giving an oral or written report respecting this petition which was presented to the Society of Friends Plymouth Meeting by Judge Corson?

Mrs. OGDEN. I don't know that the Meeting as such has ever actually received a petition from Mrs. Corson. I think it is a question that you should ask the chairman of the library committee or the clerk of the Meeting.

Mr. ARENS. In the course of your investigation did you learn whether or not——

Mrs. OGDEN. I know Mrs. Corson has sent stories to the newspapers and she sent out these mimeographed statements, but whether she actually presented that at the Meeting I think is a different thing.

Mr. ARENS. Did you ascertain in the course of this investigation which you made for this Fund for the Republic whether or not this petition was filed or presented to the Plymouth Meeting?

(The witness conferred with her counsel.)

Mr. WEBSTER. Would you mind reframing that question? I am sorry I interfered.

Mrs. OGDEN. No, I didn't ascertain that, but furthermore, Mrs. Corson is not a member of the Meeting.

Mr. ARENS. I ask you if you sent back to the Fund for the Republic the essence of this language which appears in the petition:

In other ways, too, Mrs. Knowles does harm. Longtime friendships are being strained and shattered as neighbors fight each other over her rights and beliefs. To promote domestic harmony, some husbands and wives who disagree have even found it necessary to make a pact with each other not to discuss the matter.

Did you report that type of allegation in this petition back to the Fund for the Republic in the report which you made of your investigation?

Mrs. OGDEN. Well, I did not use Mrs. Corson's phraseology there. Certainly my report said there was some dissent within the Meeting and talk about the petition in the community itself. However, I also

asked various people that I talked to whether they thought an award from the Fund would make the situation more bitter, and everyone said "No."

Mr. ARENS. Did you talk to the people who were opposed to the retention of Mary Knowles and pose that question to them?

(The witness conferred with her counsel.)

Mrs. OGDEN. No; I didn't.

The CHAIRMAN. May I ask a question?

Mrs. OGDEN. However, most of these people were not in the Meeting.

The CHAIRMAN. You say that you did report that there was dissent in the Meeting?

Mrs. OGDEN. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. How do you reconcile that with your former testimony that the people in the Meeting were unanimously in favor of it?

Mrs. OGDEN. Well, apparently the people who were dissenting in May of 1955, did not attend the Monthly Meeting for business in October of 1954, where it was discussed and furthermore a special notice of meeting was sent out concerning the meeting.

Mr. ARENS. We might just as well clear the record on the point at this time. It is a fact, is it not, that Mary Knowles was never employed, either temporarily or permanently, by the Plymouth Monthly Meeting?

(The witness conferred with her counsel.)

Mrs. OGDEN. I couldn't say that for sure, but as far as I know her employment was made permanent September 1 of 1954 by the library committee and this action was confirmed by the Meeting itself in October.

Mr. ARENS. Did the Plymouth Monthly Meeting, on the basis of your investigation, employ Mary Knowles at any time?

Mr. WEBSTER. Isn't that a technical question?

The CHAIRMAN. Do you know?

Mrs. OGDEN. As I just said, I understood that the library committee employed her and that her employment was confirmed by the Meeting.

Mr. ARENS. What is the relationship, if you please, ma'am, between the library committee and the Plymouth Monthly Meeting?

Mr. WEBSTER. If you know.

Mrs. OGDEN. I believe that the library was left by William Jeanes to the two trustees who were to be elected by the Meeting and that its policies were to be directed by the library committee itself.

Mr. ARENS. The Plymouth Monthly Meeting designates, does it not, two members to serve as trustees on the library committee? Isn't that correct?

Mrs. OGDEN. Yes.

Mr. ARENS. By and large, the library committee is autonomous, is it not? It makes its own decisions.

Mrs. OGDEN. Yes; except that it is elected by the Meeting.

Mr. ARENS. I have here a copy of an original document, addressed to the Society of Friends, Plymouth Meeting, Pennsylvania, April 19, 1955 (reading):

Five hundred and sixty-one local residents have now signed letters asking you to remove the present Jeanes librarian * * * These 561 persons signed these requests in the quiet of their own homes where no one influenced their decisions in any way.

I will skip a sentence or so because it is not pertinent to the point.

Mr. WEBSTER. Could I have a copy to follow?

Mr. ARENS. You may look at it right here with me in case I impinge in any way upon her constitutional rights.

Mr. WEBSTER. I am not suggesting that.

Mr. ARENS (reading):

Many of the 561 are long-time friends and neighbors of yours. Surely they deserve more Christian love and consideration from you than one lone 5th Amendment User who has deliberately gone out of her way to create and foster this bitter strife and dissension among us.

Now I ask you, if you took back to the Fund for the Republic that document, or if you took back the essence of the information contained in that document after you made your investigation, over the course of 1 day?

Mrs. OGDEN. I don't know whether I did or not. Furthermore, Mr. Arens, the date on this is April 19. I think it is possible that this might not have been included, Mr. Arens?

Mr. WEBSTER. Do you want the answer?

Mrs. OGDEN. Are you listening to my answer?

Mr. ARENS. Yes, ma'am.

Mr. WEBSTER. The answer thus far is——

Mr. ARENS. I hear the witness, counsel.

Mrs. OGDEN. Since this is dated April 19, toward the end of April, I don't know whether this would have been included in the file that was given to me by the library committee or not.

Mr. ARENS. So you don't know whether or not you took that information back to the Fund for the Republic——

Mrs. OGDEN. I don't know whether I did.

Mr. ARENS. As a result of your 1-day investigation?

Mrs. OGDEN. But I still want to tell you that there were certainly many statements that Mrs. Corson sent out either on blue or yellow or pink paper like that, all saying practically the same thing.

Mr. ARENS. How did you ascertain that the Plymouth Monthly Meeting confirmed the retention of Mary Knowles or the employment of Mary Knowles as librarian? How did you ascertain that fact?

Mrs. OGDEN. From excerpts from the minutes of October 1954.

Mr. ARENS. The minutes of what?

Mrs. OGDEN. Plymouth Monthly Meeting.

Mr. SCHERER. Did you actually see the minutes? Did they show them to you?

Mrs. OGDEN. I believe they took out excerpts and sent them to me or gave them to me when I went back to the Fund to read them.

Mr. SCHERER. Did you examine the original minutes?

Mrs. OGDEN. No, I didn't see the original.

Mr. SCHERER. They gave you copies of the minutes or those parts of the minutes that referred to the controversy?

Mrs. OGDEN. That is right.

Mr. SCHERER. They were given to you freely, were they not?

Mrs. OGDEN. Well, yes.

Mr. SCHERER. Nobody suggested that you didn't have a right to them?

Mrs. OGDEN. No. I didn't subpoena them.

Mr. SCHERER. You were a private agency asking for the minutes, were you not?

Mrs. OGDEN. Yes.

Mr. SCHERER. It is so different when the Congress of the United States asks for them. We can't see them.

Mr. WEBSTER. It certainly is.

The CHAIRMAN. Were these the minutes of the library committee?

Mrs. OGDEN. Of the Meeting.

Mr. SCHERER. It depends on who wants to read the minutes, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. ARENS. Did you in the course of your study and investigation of 1 day in this area ascertain that the congregation has what they call, or what I would call from an outsider characterizing it, a policy of unanimity, namely, that basic decisions will not be arrived at unless there is a unanimity of opinion?

Mrs. OGDEN. I don't believe that I understood it quite that way, not being a Quaker myself. I don't believe that I understood how unanimous the action did have to be.

Mr. ARENS. Did you deal with that issue at all in your report to the Fund for the Republic respecting the actions of the Plymouth Monthly Meeting, that by the policy of the congregation vital decisions, if not all decisions, have to be on the basis of unanimity? Did you make any reference to that at all in your report to the Fund for the Republic?

Mrs. OGDEN. No, I didn't, because I don't believe there was any occasion in my report to refer to that. What I was supposed to do was check Mr. Sprogell's memorandum. I wasn't supposed to write about the policy of the Meeting or how they conducted their meetings and that sort of thing.

Mr. ARENS. In his memorandum—and I will not burden the record at the moment with a complete recitation of it—did Mr. Sprogell allude to or were you advised by the Fund in oral conversation that there was considerable dissension in the Plymouth Monthly Meeting group over the retention of Mary Knowles as librarian?

Mrs. OGDEN. Not considerable.

Mr. ARENS. Were you advised in the report of Mr. Sprogell or by oral conversation that the decisions of the Plymouth Monthly Meeting, pursuant to the policy of the congregation, must be on the basis of unanimity?

Mrs. OGDEN. No, I don't believe complete unanimity; I knew there was supposed to be substantial agreement, but exactly what that meant in numbers I never knew.

Mr. ARENS. You never ascertained that?

Mrs. OGDEN. I never ascertained it.

Mr. ARENS. I lay before you a document entitled "My Suggestions on the Jeanes Library Controversy, Proposed by Edith C. Shoemaker at Plymouth Friends Meeting April 1955," and ask you whether or not you took back to the Fund for the Republic either that document or a copy of that document or the essence of the information in that document.

Mrs. OGDEN. I do believe that I say this. I referred to it in my report by saying that Mrs. Chapple and Mrs. Tapley were disturbed—I will read what I said here. O.K.?

Mr. ARENS. While you are reading that—excuse me. Counsel—may I see this document.

Mr. WEBSTER. Just read that whole paragraph.

Mrs. OGDEN. I will read the whole paragraph here. This comes under my heading "The Stand of Plymouth Monthly Meeting."

Mr. WEBSTER. Can you hear this, Mr. Chairman?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

Mrs. OGDEN. This is talking about people of the library committee. I said:

These people are essentially conservative. It is their deep religious convictions and not wild-eyed idealism that has persuaded them to retain Mrs. Knowles as librarian——

Mr. WEBSTER. May she finish?

Mr. ARENS. Will the counsel wait a minute.

Are you alluding there to the Plymouth Monthly Meeting or to the library committee?

Mrs. OGDEN. I am talking about the library committee.

Mr. ARENS. This exhibit which I have just laid before you pertains to the Plymouth Monthly Meeting.

Mr. WEBSTER. But this refers——

Mrs. OGDEN. This is my report and just in the previous paragraph I describe the people I talked to on the library committee.

Mr. ARENS. Would you address yourself to the question at issue?

Mrs. OGDEN. This is what I am saying right here. I don't want to read it out of context.

Mr. ARENS. All right.

Mrs. OGDEN. Talking about the library people——

They are greatly disturbed by the inability of some of the members of the Meeting to agree with their acceptance of Mrs. Knowles. The Quakers' desire for peace—to be true Friends—and their opposition to loyalty oaths, are in direct conflict.

The leaders of the Meeting are currently thinking of asking other Friends to visit Plymouth Monthly Meetings to lend their spiritual strength. Mrs. Chapple hopes that the rift within the Meeting can be healed with as much understanding and as little loss as possible.

Mr. ARENS. Would you kindly address yourself to the questions at issue, namely——

Mr. WEBSTER. Mr. Arens, is that a fair characterization?

Mr. ARENS. I respectfully suggest counsel be advised that under the rules of the committee your sole and exclusive function is to advise your client.

Now I ask you whether or not you told the Fund for the Republic of the protest which was made by Mrs. Shoemaker on the Jeanes Library controversy entitled "My Suggestion" etc. dated April 1955.

Mrs. OGDEN. I didn't call Mrs. Shoemaker. I didn't quote her name as such. I said:

They are greatly disturbed by the inability of some members of the committee to agree with their acceptance of Mrs. Knowles.

Mr. ARENS. How extensive did you find public criticism to be of the employment and retention of Mary Knowles?

Mrs. OGDEN. You mean in Plymouth Meeting?

Mr. ARENS. Yes, let's take it that way. Let's take Plymouth Monthly Meeting first.

Mrs. OGDEN. I didn't make a poll of the members of the Meeting, if that is what you are suggesting.

Mr. ARENS. As a matter of fact, you only talked to 1 person who was opposed to Mary Knowles and that was 1 person by telephone, isn't that true?

Mrs. OGDEN. That is true except I saw the statements of the other people in the newspapers and in the file that I have.

Mr. ARENS. Now could you tell the committee your appraisal as to how extensive public criticism was of the retention of Mary Knowles? What was your appraisal of the extent of the public criticism on the retention of Mary Knowles?

Mrs. OGDEN. What do you mean by public? Do you mean this community?

Mr. ARENS. I mean only which is alluded to in the report which you were either to confirm or investigate.

Mrs. OGDEN. From what Mrs. Corson said I gathered that she had the names of 468 people who were opposed to Mrs. Knowles. However, the only people whose opinions really matter are the people in the Meeting.

Mr. ARENS. How many people in the Meeting did you interview who were opposed to the retention of Mary Knowles?

Mrs. OGDEN. I didn't interview any of the people.

Mr. ARENS. Now, I invite your attention to the assertion in the so-called Sprogell memorandum which we have identified as "Ogden Exhibit No. 1" of your testimony—

Mr. WEBSTER. I want to keep this straight. Is the Sprogell report No. 1 or is Mrs. Ogden's report No. 1?

Mr. ARENS. —which memorandum we have identified as Ogden Exhibit No. 1, during your testimony in which Mr. Sprogell says—

Mr. WEBSTER. What page, please, Mr. Arens?

Mr. ARENS. Reading from page 2—apparently, I assume from the context, referring to the Monthly Meeting:

the Meeting conducted a careful investigation into her conduct since 1947.

Did you make an investigation yourself to ascertain whether or not this assertion contained in the Sprogell memorandum was true?

Mr. WEBSTER. Would you mind reading the rest of it? The question isn't really intelligible, Mr. Arens, I submit.

Mr. ARENS. Does the witness understand that I am alluding to the Sprogell memorandum in which Mr. Sprogell says that the Meeting conducted a careful investigation into Mrs. Knowles' conduct. Now, I am asking you as to whether or not you made an ascertainment as to whether the Plymouth Monthly Meeting did make a careful investigation into Mrs. Knowles' conduct since 1947.

Mrs. OGDEN. While I am not absolutely positive, I believe that I say the statement that they presented to the Monthly Meeting concerning their employment of Mrs. Knowles, saying they had made this investigation.

Mr. ARENS. Did you ascertain whether or not a careful investigation—

Mr. SCHERER. Pardon me. You say a statement. Where did you get this statement that they presented to you?

Mrs. OGDEN. From the library committee.

Mr. SCHERER. From the library committee? The Meeting presented it to the library committee?

Mrs. OGDEN. No; that the library committee had presented to the Meeting concerning their employment of Mrs. Knowles.

Mr. ARENS. Did you, during your 1-day investigation, inquire as to whether or not in this investigation of Mary Knowles' conduct——

Mrs. OGDEN. I didn't say it was a 1-day investigation.

Mr. ARENS. There was an inquiry as to Mary Knowles' conduct before a Senate committee?

Mrs. OGDEN. Could you repeat that one, sir?

Mr. ARENS. Mr. Sprogell in his memorandum says that there was a careful investigation conducted by the Plymouth Monthly Meeting with reference to Mrs. Knowles' conduct since 1947. I am now asking you, in view of the fact that you were to check on these facts, whether or not you ascertained if this investigation included an inquiry as to Mary Knowles' conduct before a Senate committee. Did you ask anyone here if they made an inquiry into Mary Knowles' conduct before the Senate committee?

Mrs. OGDEN. May I have a minute here to look.

(The witness conferred with her counsel.)

Mr. ARENS. In the event you may be a little confused by the question, I am only asking you whether or not when you were in the Plymouth Meeting area you made an inquiry to ascertain the nature of the investigation which Mr. Sprogell said had been made by the Plymouth Monthly Meeting concerning Mary Knowles' conduct.

Mrs. OGDEN. I just saw the statement that they had given to the Meeting saying they had made this investigation.

Mr. ARENS. Who had made the investigation?

Mrs. OGDEN. The members of the library committee.

Mr. ARENS. And did you ascertain whether or not it was a careful investigation, and whether or not it was an investigation which encompassed the attitude and conduct of Mrs. Knowles before the Senate committee?

Mrs. OGDEN. I didn't go into the details of their investigation but I assume if they were satisfied and the members of the Meeting were satisfied with their investigation——

Mr. WEBSTER. Which meeting are you talking about?

Mr. ARENS. Counsel will have to be advised again your sole and exclusive function is to advise your client.

The CHAIRMAN. Have you answered the question?

Mrs. OGDEN. I said that I had not determined the methods or the details of the investigation of the library committee, but I assumed, since these people who were upstanding citizens in their communities had made this investigation to the best of their conscience and that the Monthly Meeting had accepted their findings, that it was a bona fide investigation.

Mr. SCHERER. Mr. Chairman, may I ask a question?

Did you know at the time you were making this investigation that Mrs. Knowles had appeared before the Internal Security Subcommittee of the Senate of the United States?

Mrs. OGDEN. In 1953?

Mr. SCHERER. When were you making this investigation?

Mrs. OGDEN. When was that? It was in May 1953, that she appeared before the Jenner committee; wasn't it?

Mr. ARENS. She appeared before you came to this area. You knew that.

Mrs. OGDEN. Yes.

Mr. SCHERER. In May 1953. That is the public record. I have the testimony here.

Mrs. OGDEN. I believe that is here in Mr. Sprogell's memorandum.

Mr. SCHERER. Did you know at that time, then, that she had appeared before the Senate committee?

Mrs. OGDEN. Yes.

Mr. ARENS. There is confusion on this record which I think ought to be cleared at this point. Mr. Sprogell in his report says the Meeting conducted a careful investigation into her conduct since 1947. You found no evidence that the Meeting had conducted a careful investigation into her conduct, did you? The investigation that you were alluding to was the interrogation of Mrs. Knowles by the library committee; isn't that correct?

Mrs. OGDEN. To the best of my recollection it was the library committee that conducted the investigation but, after all, the library committee is elected by the Meeting and they are acting as their representatives.

Mr. ARENS. Then Mr. Sprogell was at least, let us say, in slight error when he said that the Meeting had conducted the investigation; is that correct?

Mr. WEBSTER. Mr. Chairman, is that a fair question?

The CHAIRMAN. I think the record speaks for itself.

Mr. SCHERER. I want to come back for just a minute to my question. You knew when you made this investigation that Mrs. Knowles had testified before a committee of the Senate of the United States; did you not?

Mrs. OGDEN. I believe I read that in Mr. Sprogell's memorandum; yes. The first page.

Mr. SCHERER. When you read that, did you get a copy of her testimony before the—

Mrs. OGDEN. No; because I wasn't investigating Mrs. Knowles. I was simply verifying this memorandum.

Mr. SCHERER. You didn't think it was necessary in the verification of a memorandum which purported to investigate the whole circumstances surrounding Mrs. Knowles' retention, to take a look for yourself at the report of the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee? You didn't even read that testimony?

Mrs. OGDEN. I didn't think it was my business to investigate Mrs. Knowles' past. It was my business to investigate—

Mr. SCHERER. No, but you were investigating a report which referred to a so-called impartial investigation of this woman, were you not? That is what you were doing?

Mrs. OGDEN. That is right.

Mr. SCHERER. How could you make such an investigation unless you read what I would consider at least a very, very important public document in determining your report to the Fund for the Republic; namely, her testimony before the Senate of the United States.

Did you know that she had invoked the fifth amendment?

Mr. WEBSTER. It tells in here, Mr. Congressman, that she—

Mr. SCHERER. I am just asking the witness what she did. You advise her as to her constitutional rights.

Mrs. OGDEN. I understand, as it says here in Mr. Sprogell's memorandum, that she invoked the fifth amendment in 1953 before the Jenner committee.

Mr. SCHERER. All right. All I wanted to know is whether or not you yourself read her testimony as a result of the information you acquired from reading the Sprogell memorandum.

Mrs. OGDEN. No; I didn't, because I wasn't concerned with Mrs. Knowles' past.

Mr. SCHERER. Therefore, you did not discuss this matter with any of the staff of the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee; did you?

Mrs. OGDEN. No. I was simply supposed to find out what was going on in Plymouth Monthly Meeting.

Mr. SCHERER. Do you not think that the staff of the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee might have as much information or pertinent information, at least as much as the Meeting had, whose minutes you did investigate?

Mr. WEBSTER. Mr. Scherer, that is pretty speculative.

Mr. SCHERER. I am asking the witness. Didn't it occur to you, even if you didn't read the testimony that was available, that you might go and discuss the matter with the staff of the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee or any member of that committee?

Mr. WEBSTER. May I refer to the memorandum a minute Mr. Scherer?

Mr. SCHERER. No. I am asking the witness some questions.

Mr. WEBSTER. I want to point out it contains the facts that she was asked to investigate in the memorandum. I can hand that up to you, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Instructions to her? Is that what the memo is?

Mr. WEBSTER. No. The memorandum of Mr. Sprogell is the memorandum which she has testified she was—

The CHAIRMAN. Is it a memorandum given to her with instructions as to what to inquire into?

Mr. WEBSTER. No.

Mr. SCHERER. It is the memorandum that she was to investigate and determine whether or not that memorandum was correct. That memorandum, as I understand, contains—I have never seen it but from listening to the testimony—contains an allegation that this woman did appear before the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee, and did testify, and did invoke the fifth amendment.

Mr. WEBSTER. Mr. Scherer, may I ask you just to take a moment and read it?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes, I will.

Mr. SCHERER. I don't wish to read it at this point. I understand from the testimony that it does contain such an allegation. I am merely asking this witness if that report, about which she was to determine the truth or falsity, contained such an allegation.

Mr. WEBSTER. I am handing you my copy, Mr. Scherer.

Mr. SCHERER. And whether or not this witness, with that information before her, didn't see fit at least to read the record of this woman's testimony before the committee or whether or not she didn't even go to talk to some member of the staff or some member of the committee of the Senate, who certainly knew more about this situation, perhaps, than the Friends Meeting.

Mrs. OGDEN. I understood I was to go to Plymouth Meeting to find out what the situation was there at the present. I didn't understand that I was to find out what Mrs. Knowles had said before a Senate committee or to investigate her past. The library committee had done that themselves.

Mr. SCHERER. But, Madam, you just said that you were to investigate the truth or falsity of the Sprogell memorandum, which contains certain allegations.

Mrs. OGDEN. Concerning the events in Plymouth Meeting.

The CHAIRMAN. Let me read the pertinent section of the memorandum furnished you which you were to investigate.

In 1953 the Library Committee, seeking a temporary librarian because of illness of its permanent employee, received an application from Mary Knowles, a fully qualified librarian. Mrs. Knowles had been a secretary at the Samuel Adams School in the suburbs of Boston from 1945 to 1947. She had then taken employment as librarian in a Massachusetts community. While she was employed there Herbert Philbrick gave testimony concerning her before the Jenner Committee. It is generally assumed that he testified that she had been a member of the Communist Party while at the Samuel Adams School.

Did you investigate this assumption, or weren't you concerned about that?

Mrs. OGDEN. I understood "generally assumed"—that it is phrased that way because it was an executive hearing.

The CHAIRMAN. Executive hearing? Here is the printed hearing. It is a public document. It is United States Government Printing Office document.

Mrs. OGDEN. Has it been released since the library committee made its investigation?

The CHAIRMAN. This is a public document.

Mrs. OGDEN. Has it always been one?

The CHAIRMAN. From the time it was printed. I suppose 20 minutes after the hearing was closed it was in the hands of the printer.

It is generally assumed that she testified. Didn't you make inquiry into the facts or into the statement in order to determine whether or not it was correct?

Mrs. OGDEN. That was not what I was supposed to do in Plymouth Meeting.

The CHAIRMAN. The fact of the matter is, neither you nor the Fund for the Republic was concerned with whether or not she had ever been a Communist?

Mrs. OGDEN. I can't speak for the Fund for the Republic. You will have to ask their officers.

Mr. ARENS. Also in the Sprogell report I see the following paragraph:

Ever since that time the Meeting has been the object of repeated onslaughts by a small determined group in the community whose object is to compel the Meeting to dismiss Mrs. Knowles.

Did you investigate as to whether or not the opposition to Mrs. Knowles' retention as librarian came from a small group or what—

Mrs. OGDEN. Mrs. Corson told me on the telephone that the number of her group of Alerted Americans was 30 at that point.

Mr. ARENS. Did you take back to the Fund for the Republic these accounts of hundreds of people signing petitions protesting the retention of Mary Knowles?

Mrs. OGDEN. Are you talking about active members of the position? There is a difference between active people working to oust——

Mr. ARENS. Mr. Sprogell's report says, "a small determined group in the community" is opposing Mary Knowles.

Mrs. OGDEN. That means actively working, which was the Alerted Americans.

Mr. ARENS. Did you report to the Fund for the Republic in effect that the opposition to Mary Knowles in the community was a small group?

Mrs. OGDEN. I said it was small. I also told the number who had signed petitions.

Mr. ARENS. Did you report to the Fund for the Republic that only 28 of the total membership of 108 in 1955 are on the record at a Plymouth Monthly Meeting as approving the retention of Mary Knowles? Did you report that fact to the Fund for the Republic in your report?

Mrs. OGDEN. No.

Mr. ARENS. Was it a fact?

Mrs. OGDEN. I don't know.

Mr. ARENS. Did you undertake to ascertain what the facts were with reference to the number of members of Plymouth Monthly Meeting who were on record as approving the retention of Mary Knowles?

Mrs. OGDEN. I didn't make a numerical count of the pro and con in the Meeting.

Mr. ARENS. Did you make any investigation to ascertain the situation with reference to the librarian who was the predecessor to Mary Knowles? Her name slips my mind at the moment.

Mrs. OGDEN. Mrs. Sawyer.

Mr. ARENS. Did you make an investigation to ascertain what had happened to Mrs. Sawyer?

Mrs. OGDEN. I understood that she had fallen down and broken her hip and had become incapacitated and that Mrs. Knowles was employed temporarily as librarian.

Mr. ARENS. And then Mrs. Sawyer resumed her occupation?

Mrs. OGDEN. Mrs. Sawyer got better and came back. I also understand that Mrs. Sawyer was either at or beyond the age of retirement and had been talking about retiring for several years.

Mr. ARENS. Did you ascertain any information respecting allegations that Mrs. Sawyer, notwithstanding her long years of service, was in effect being forced out of her job as librarian by the pro-Mary Knowles faction? Did you make any ascertainment on that issue?

Mr. WEBSTER. Mr. Chairman, is that a fair question? May I ask you just in the interest of fairness——

The CHAIRMAN. Let us withdraw the question and let me ask a question.

Did you know that when Mrs. Knowles testified before the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee it was because of a request made——

Mrs. OGDEN. When was this, Mr. Walter?

The CHAIRMAN. The only time she appeared, the only time she testified.

(Representative Scherer left the hearing room.)

Mrs. OGDEN. You mean in 1953?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes. This was Thursday, September 15, 1955.

Mrs. OGDEN. Excuse me, Mr. Walter. What is the exact date of that?

The CHAIRMAN. September 15, 1955.

Mrs. OGDEN. That is after the Fund award was made, and that is after my report.

Mr. ARENS. The record shows that Mrs. Knowles appeared before the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee, I believe, on 3 occasions, at least 1 or 2 of which were before the award was made and before your investigation. There is no question about that.

Mrs. OGDEN. Is that the same report you were referring to before, Mr. Walter?

The CHAIRMAN. I think it is, yes.

Mr. WEBSTER. May I ask, Mr. Walter, if that is not the report of 1955 that relates to Mrs. Knowles' most recent Senate appearance long after the award was made?

The CHAIRMAN. This is part 14.

Mrs. OGDEN. That is after the award was made and after my report.

Mr. ARENS. It was after Mrs. Knowles had appeared before the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee and long before you made your investigations, isn't that correct? You know, of course.

Mrs. OGDEN. In May of 1953, that is right.

Mr. ARENS. Tell this committee——

The CHAIRMAN. Let's get the record straight. I was mistaken. Thursday, May 21, 1953.

Mr. ARENS. Now tell this committee whether or not in the course of your investigation of the Mary Knowles controversy you learned that there was also in the controversy the issue as to the reasons why Mrs. Sawyer was going to leave her job.

Mrs. OGDEN. I assume she was going to leave it because she was either, as I said, at the age of retirement or beyond and wasn't fully recovered from her accident.

Mr. ARENS. Were you advised or did you learn from any of your interviews that the charges were brought that Mrs. Sawyer was being forced out of her job?

Mr. WEBSTER. Mr. Chairman, that is the same question.

Mr. ARENS. It is not the same question.

Mr. Chairman, this witness has been testifying all day what she learned from interviews. I am only asking whether she learned——

Mrs. OGDEN. No, I never learned that Mrs. Sawyer was being forced out of her job.

Mr. ARENS. That is the answer to the question.

Did you report to the Fund for the Republic on the basis of your investigation as to the number of the members of the Plymouth Monthly Meeting who resigned from the Meeting in protest against the retention of Mary Knowles? Did you report that to the Fund for the Republic?

Mrs. OGDEN. When did they resign?

Mr. ARENS. I just ask you whether or not you ascertained that fact and reported it to the Fund for the Republic, that members of the Plymouth Monthly Meeting resigned in protest.

Mrs. OGDEN. Oh. Well, I know that Mr. Sheppard resigned.

Mr. WEBSTER. Was that the reason?

Mrs. OGDEN. I don't know if that was quite the reason. I have heard another reason given.

Mr. ARENS. Did you know and did you report to the Fund for the Republic that in the aggregate 884 persons in the general community

of the Jeanes Library signed petitions asking that Mary Knowles be dismissed?

Mr. WEBSTER. 800 different persons?

Mr. ARENS. 884 different persons.

Mr. WEBSTER. Or 800 signatures?

Mr. ARENS. Counsel, kindly let us conduct the hearing.

Mrs. OGDEN. As I told you before—can I answer this question?

Mr. ARENS. Yes, please.

Mrs. OGDEN. As I told you before, the latest information I had was the report from Mrs. Corson, either her mimeographed statement of a newspaper story, saying that she had the petitions of 468 people.

Mr. ARENS. Did you not report that there were 884 persons who had signed various petitions in the aggregate protesting the retention of Mary Knowles?

Mrs. OGDEN. I never saw such a statement. Was there such a statement in existence in May, May 2, 1955?

Mr. WEBSTER. May I ask Mr. Arens if he is reading from a paper we can use to refresh Mrs. Ogden's recollection.

The CHAIRMAN. If she does not know, the answer is "I do not remember."

Mr. ARENS. What is the date on which you completed your investigation?

Mr. WEBSTER. The question implies that Mr. Arens has some special information.

The CHAIRMAN. There is no such implication. Let Mr. Arens ask the question.

(Representative Scherer returned to the hearing room.)

Mr. ARENS. Now, would you tell us the date on which you completed your investigation and made your report?

Mrs. OGDEN. The date of my report is May 9, 1955.

Mr. ARENS. Did you subsequently learn after you had submitted your report that one of the members of the Plymouth Monthly Meeting had sent a letter under date of March 6, 1956, to Robert Hutchins, of the Fund for the Republic, stating in effect that the Plymouth Monthly Meeting did not deserve the proposed award since the majority were opposed to Mary Knowles and that the Meeting had not accepted the award and that it was being held in escrow and that if the Fund had properly investigated the facts it would have ascertained that the majority was in opposition and the award unjustified for the purpose stated in the presentation speech?

Mr. WEBSTER. May I ask Mr. Arens for the date of that letter?

Mr. ARENS. March 1956. Did you know that, Mrs. Ogden?

Mrs. OGDEN. And the person by whom it was written. March 1956.

Mr. ARENS. By Carroll Corson.

Mrs. OGDEN. However, Mr. Arens, let me say at this moment that the minutes of the meeting reflect that in June of 1955 when the Meeting was told of the award that was going to be made by the Fund for the Republic they were given a description of the work of the Fund, they were told by the directors of the Fund, and no one raised any objection. The only question asked was by Carroll Corson, who asked if any money was involved.

Mr. SCHERER. Did you see those minutes? Did you yourself see those minutes or have excerpts given to you?

Mrs. OGDEN. I have seen excerpts and I have been told by Mrs. Chapple, of the library committee, that this is what happened.

Mr. SCHERER. They wouldn't give our investigator any information, wouldn't let her see the minutes or records or anything else.

Mr. WEBSTER. Unlike the Fund for the Republic, which gave complete information.

Mr. ARENS. Now, may I ask you this: Has the award actually been accepted by the Plymouth Monthly Meeting?

Mrs. OGDEN. No; it is being held in escrow. But may I say something further. May I say that in March of this year there was a yearly meeting, I believe the 276th yearly meeting, at which 500 delegates of 93 Meetings unanimously upheld the decision of the Civil Liberties Committee in providing a legal defense fund for Mrs. Knowles, and that at that meeting there were people from Plymouth Monthly Meeting and I believe also that Carroll Corson was there then and he didn't raise any objections. I think these people who object should object in the meeting.

Mr. ARENS. May I read you this letter addressed to Robert M. Hutchins, president of the Fund for the Republic, under date of March 6, 1956, and ask you whether or not in your judgment on the basis of your investigation this recites the facts. Counsel, kindly restrain yourself while I address the question to the witness.

DEAR DR. HUTCHINS: Through my association at Haverford College with Gilbert White I have gained the impression that you are a very understanding person.

Last year when the Fund for the Republic gave the Plymouth Monthly Meeting a check for \$5,000 for their courageous stand, unfortunately I was in Europe. This gift was never brought before the Monthly Meeting before it was presented—

Mrs. OGDEN. He was at a Monthly Meeting in June, however, where they were told the Meeting was to receive an award, and Carroll Corson was there.

Mr. ARENS (continuing reading):

as I attended the meeting in June. At the time the award was made, a majority of the adult members, after the Jenner committee reports had been made known, requested that Mrs. Knowles be dismissed.

Was that an accurate representation of the facts?

Mrs. OGDEN. What does it say, after the award was made a majority?

Mr. ARENS (reads):

At the time the award was made, a majority of the adult members, after the Jenner committee reports had been made known, requested that Mrs. Knowles be dismissed.

Mrs. OGDEN. Can I ask you a question first, Mr. Arens? I was called here today, wasn't I, in connection with a report I wrote?

Mr. ARENS. I am only asking you whether you know this is a fact.

Mrs. OGDEN. This is something that occurred after I wrote the report.

Mr. ARENS. If you do not know just say "I do not know," and that will end that inquiry.

Mr. WEBSTER. The occurrence as such occurred afterwards.

Mr. ARENS. I understand.

Mrs. OGDEN. No; I don't know that to be a fact.

Mr. ARENS. May I read more of the language of this letter, some of which pertains to matters which transpired prior to the time you made your investigation.

Mr. WEBSTER. May I have a copy of the letter?

Mr. ARENS (reading) :

Last year I was chairman of the Finance Committee and I could have simply mailed the check back, which was cashed by an overzealous convinced Friend without the permission of the Treasurer or by myself.

The Treasurer refused to accept the check and unfortunately the bank did cash it. Not wanting to create further publicity, I did not send the money back, but asked the Meeting what they wanted to do with it. Finally it was decided to put it in escrow. The money now lies there, bearing no interest, serving no useful purpose, and since it takes unanimity to take such a move when such a minute is passed, I would suggest you ask the Meeting to either accept it or send it back so that it can be put to some useful purpose.

It is extremely unfortunate that your committee did not really investigate the facts, and it has widened the split and made the Meeting most ineffectual. I think you can realize by accepting this gift that Mary Knowles would have a life position and, frankly, it will never be accepted. It is quite possible that the Meeting may finally come to some decision on Mary Knowles, but as long as this gift hangs over it, it is impossible.

I regret very much the unfortunate publicity.

and so forth.

Mr. WEBSTER. May we see it?

Mr. ARENS. Yes, sir.

Mrs. OGDEN. First, I would like to comment that I don't see how Mr. Corson could have sent the money back as chairman of the finance committee. If it took an action of the Meeting to accept the money, it seems to me it would take an action of the entire Meeting unanimously to send it back.

Mr. ARENS. Did you report to the Fund for the Republic that because of Mary Knowles' employment in the library there had been withdrawn from the library fund contributions from the township, from the community chest, from the school board, and that the school board forbade the teachers to bring the children to the library? Did you report all that to the Fund for the Republic?

Mrs. OGDEN. I did. Yes.

Mr. ARENS. Mr. Chairman, I respectfully suggest that will conclude the staff interrogation of this witness.

The CHAIRMAN. Off the record.

(Off the record.)

Mr. ARENS. Is Mr. Sheppard here, please? Could you kindly step forward just a minute, Mr. Sheppard? You were scheduled to be the next witness. The hour now being 12:30, the committee is disposed to recess, and we wonder if you could conveniently return at 2 o'clock?

Mr. SHEPPARD. Yes; that is all right.

The CHAIRMAN. The committee will stand in recess until 2 o'clock.

(Whereupon, at 12:30 p. m., the committee was recessed, to reconvene at 2 p. m. the same day.)

AFTERNOON SESSION, WEDNESDAY, JULY 18, 1956

The CHAIRMAN. The committee will come to order.

Call your next witness, Mr. Arens.

Mr. ARENS. Mr. Isaac Sheppard, kindly come forward. Remain standing, please.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you swear that the testimony you are about to give will be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

Mr. SHEPPARD. I do.

TESTIMONY OF ISAAC J. SHEPPARD

Mr. ARENS. Kindly identify yourself by name, residence, and occupation.

Mr. SHEPPARD. My name is Isaac J. Sheppard. My residence is 15531 Sandy Hill Road, Norristown, Pa. My occupation is president of the Peerless Paper Mills.

Mr. ARENS. Mr. Sheppard, are you a member of the Plymouth Monthly Meeting?

Mr. SHEPPARD. Yes; I am.

Mr. ARENS. Kindly describe what is the Plymouth Monthly Meeting.

Mr. SHEPPARD. It is the Religious Society of Friends and I am a birthright member.

Mr. ARENS. Would you kindly indicate just in passing what is a birthright member of the Society of Friends?

Mr. SHEPPARD. It is one whose father and mother were members of the Society of Friends when the person was born.

Mr. ARENS. Have you ever been identified with the William Jeanes Memorial Library?

Mr. SHEPPARD. Yes, I have.

Mr. ARENS. Please tell us in what capacity you have been identified with that library?

Mr. SHEPPARD. The bequest for the library under the will of Mary R. Miller became available in 1926. I was appointed to the library committee at that time and served as chairman until 1933, at which time the library was opened and I was treasurer of the library from 1933 until September 1, 1954.

Mr. ARENS. What happened at that time? I don't mean all the facts, but what occasioned your disassociation from the treasurer-ship in 1954?

Mr. SHEPPARD. The primary reason was the decision of the library committee to employ Mary Knowles on a permanent basis.

Mr. ARENS. May I ask you this: Did you resign at that time? That is what I want the record to reflect at this time; how you happened to become disassociated.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I registered a protest vote and resigned at that time to become effective September 1, 1954.

Mr. ARENS. Kindly tell us, if you will, please, sir, the relationship between the library committee and the Plymouth Monthly Meeting.

Mr. SHEPPARD. The Plymouth Monthly Meeting appoints the trustees who have charge of the endowment fund, and they also appoint the library committee who run and operate the library.

Mr. ARENS. Is the library committee what we might characterize as autonomous? Can it make decisions independently of confirmation or rejection by the Plymouth Monthly Meeting?

Mr. SHEPPARD. Yes, they can.

Mr. ARENS. Does it customarily make its decisions on a basis of autonomy?

Mr. SHEPPARD. Yes, they do.

Mr. ARENS. Before we proceed further, did the Plymouth Monthly Meeting at any time hire Mary Knowles?

Mr. SHEPPARD. No.

Mr. ARENS. Did the Plymouth Monthly Meeting at any time confirm by formal action the hiring of Mary Knowles?

Mr. SHEPPARD. I have no direct knowledge of that.

Mr. ARENS. Did the Plymouth Monthly Meeting at any time accept an award from the Fund for the Republic?

Mr. SHEPPARD. I understand the award was not accepted but is held in escrow.

Mr. ARENS. Mr. Sheppard, did the young lady who appeared this morning, whose maiden name was Maureen Black and whose married name, according to the record, is Maureen Black Ogden, at any time during the course of her appearance in the Plymouth Meeting area interview you?

Mr. SHEPPARD. No.

Mr. ARENS. Tell us just a word about your public service. I appreciate normal modesty in a person talking about his career of public service, but could you just allude to some of the offices and posts you have held in this community in addition to your long tenure of treasurership of the library committee?

Mr. SHEPPARD. I have had several civic activities over the period of the years. I was Secretary of the Commissioners of Plymouth Township from 1921 until 1953, a period of 32 years. I am presently on the Zoning Board of the township. I am presently on the Board of Health, serving as secretary, and have been since 1925.

Mr. ARENS. Have you been identified as a director of a bank in the community?

Mr. SHEPPARD. I am a director of the People's National Bank of Norristown.

Mr. ARENS. In 1955 did you receive any public recognition of your service to the community?

Mr. SHEPPARD. I received I guess you would call it an outstanding citizen award from the Plymouth-Whitemarsh Junior Chamber of Commerce.

Mr. ARENS. Mr. Sheppard, is there an American Legion post which is named in honor of your son who sacrificed his life for this country?

Mr. SHEPPARD. The Casey Sheppard Post is named partially in honor of my son, yes.

Mr. ARENS. Now would you kindly tell us in your own words the events which transpired leading up to the temporary engagement of Mary Knowles by the library committee?

Mr. SHEPPARD. In the summer of 1953 the then present librarian, Edith Sawyer, was injured while she was on vacation, which required her hospitalization. The library tried to get along for a few weeks with the employment of many substitutes to take her place on a part-time basis. The committee decided that they needed to employ someone as a substitute until Mrs. Sawyer was restored to health and could return as librarian. In October 1953, Mary Knowles appeared before the library committee and told of her qualifications. She also told of her connection with the Samuel Adams School, stating that she served as secretary to the head of the school, that she had been called

before a Senate investigating committee and had refused to testify because she feared she would intimidate some of her friends.

Mr. ARENS. May I interpose this question at this place, please, Mr. Sheppard.

Mr. WEBSTER. Did you mean "incriminate"?

Mr. SHEPPARD. Yes, incriminate.

Mr. ARENS. Will counsel kindly restrain himself so we can proceed in orderly fashion.

Who on the library committee was charged with the responsibility of engaging a librarian to temporarily replace Mrs. Sawyer?

Mr. SHEPPARD. I think we were all charged with the responsibility. Lillian Tapley was the one who made the investigation, and I believe it was at her instigation that Mary Knowles appeared before the committee for the temporary position.

Mr. ARENS. Was there at that time in October of 1953 any opposition registered within the library committee itself to the hiring on a temporary basis of Mary Knowles?

Mr. SHEPPARD. No, there was not.

Mr. ARENS. After the engagement of Mary Knowles on the temporary basis was that action by the library committee at any time confirmed by the Plymouth Monthly Meeting?

Mr. SHEPPARD. Not to my knowledge.

Mr. ARENS. While the regular librarian, Mrs. Sawyer, was home convalescing, did you have any occasion to discuss with her the security of her position as soon as she had completely recovered her health?

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mrs. Sawyer was in the hospital at the time Mary Knowles was engaged on a temporary basis, and she became somewhat disturbed by a rumor that Mrs. Knowles was going to be employed permanently and she would be out of a position. I assured her that that was not my understanding, that it was my understanding that Mary Knowles was only employed temporarily until such time as Mrs. Sawyer would be able to return and take over the activities of librarian again.

Mr. ARENS. Tell us, please, who is Judge Corson?

Mr. SHEPPARD. He is judge of the Court of Common Pleas of Montgomery County.

Mr. ARENS. What relationship or identity does he have with respect to the Plymouth Monthly Meeting?

Mr. SHEPPARD. I feel that Judge Corson is a rather prominent member of the Plymouth Monthly Meeting.

Mr. ARENS. Did you take up with Judge Corson the issue as to whether or not Mrs. Sawyer would be reengaged by the Plymouth Monthly Meeting as soon as she had recovered her health?

Mr. SHEPPARD. I became somewhat concerned by the attitude of certain other members of the library committee who wanted to retain Mary Knowles on a permanent basis, and I went to Judge Corson and explained the situation and explained what I knew at that time about Mary Knowles' background.

Mr. ARENS. Was the matter taken up in the Plymouth Monthly Meeting as to whether or not Mrs. Sawyer would be reinstated in her job as librarian as soon as she had recovered her health?

Mr. SHEPPARD. I believe it was, because Mrs. Sawyer was subsequently reinstated.

Mr. ARENS. How long was Mrs. Sawyer out with her physical impairment, a broken hip, I believe it was stated?

Mr. SHEPPARD. She was out from her vacation period in August until, I believe, around the early part of April 1954 although I have a letter from her physician which is dated January 25, 1954, stating that—

Mrs. Sawyer is now quite well and able to resume her duties as librarian beginning on a half-time schedule immediately.

Mr. ARENS. In any event, in approximately April of 1954, it is your testimony, is it not, sir, that Mrs. Sawyer resumed her duties and responsibilities and I take it assumed the pay of librarian again?

Mr. SHEPPARD. That is right.

Mr. ARENS. How long did Mrs. Sawyer then maintain her status as librarian after she had returned to the library in April?

Mr. SHEPPARD. Until September 1, 1954.

Mr. ARENS. In the interval between the time Mrs. Sawyer returned in April 1954 until the time of her departure, to your observation did anything transpire with reference to her status in the library?

Mr. SHEPPARD. The library committee drew up what I felt was a very unfair contract or agreement for Mrs. Sawyer to sign and abide by, laying down certain rules, regulations, and so forth, as to how she should conduct the library, the specific hours that she should be there, and so forth, to which I objected because the library had been open for more than 20 years and no librarian had ever been subject to any such contract before.

Mr. ARENS. Do you recall whether or not Mrs. Sawyer was under suggestion by any member of the library committee as to what she was to say if anyone inquired respecting Mary Knowles?

Mr. SHEPPARD. I was told by Mrs. Sawyer that she was informed by a member of the library committee that if anyone asked if Mary Knowles was a Communist she should say "No."

Mr. ARENS. To your knowledge what did Mrs. Sawyer say in response to that direction?

Mr. SHEPPARD. I believe Mrs. Sawyer answered that she did not know one way or the other and she couldn't answer the question.

Mr. ARENS. To your knowledge could you tell us where Mary Knowles was, where did she go or what did she do, after Mrs. Sawyer returned to her job in April of 1954?

Mr. SHEPPARD. I haven't the slightest idea.

Mr. ARENS. Do you know why Mrs. Sawyer resigned?

Mr. SHEPPARD. I feel that it was prompted primarily by the unkind action of certain members of the library committee. Mrs. Sawyer had never intimated the thought of resignation before she returned as librarian about April 1.

Mr. ARENS. After Mrs. Sawyer resigned, what happened from the standpoint of producing a librarian for the library committee?

Mr. SHEPPARD. The library committee had knowledge that Mrs. Sawyer was going to retire on September 1, and Mrs. Tapley, I believe, was charged with the responsibility of inserting certain advertisements, I believe, in the American Library Journal, or some library publication, in other words, a help-wanted ad, and received some applications as a result of that advertising.

Mr. ARENS. Please go ahead with the theme of your narrative. Was a librarian procured, and if so, who?

Mr. SHEPPARD. At a meeting—I don't recall whether it was the latter part of July or early August—Mrs. Tapley presented the applications that she had received to the library committee. They were not acceptable to any of us by reason of inexperience, salary demands, and they were all rejected. Mrs. Tapley then informed me that they had decided, meaning of course, the four other members of the library committee who were then present—they had decided anyway to employ Mary Knowles on a permanent basis.

Mr. ARENS. Tell us, if you please, sir, how many members were there of the library committee on this date. This was in July of 1954; was it not?

Mr. SHEPPARD. Yes. I believe there were eight members at that time.

Mr. ARENS. How many were in attendance at the meeting where it was announced that Mrs. Knowles would be reemployed on a permanent basis?

Mr. SHEPPARD. There were five.

Mr. ARENS. Who were the three who were not present?

Mr. SHEPPARD. The three who were not present were Henry Hemsley, Lewis Sheppard—

Mr. ARENS. Excuse me. Is he your brother?

Mr. SHEPPARD. He is my brother. They were representatives of the Commissioners of Plymouth Township. Under the laws of the State of Pennsylvania it is a legal necessity for a municipality making appropriations to a library to be represented by at least two members of the board on the committee. The other member who was not present was Mrs. Browning.

Mr. ARENS. B-r-o-w-n-i-n-g?

Mr. SHEPPARD. That is right.

Mr. ARENS. What was your attitude toward the employment of Mary Knowles on a permanent basis?

Mr. SHEPPARD. My attitude was in opposition to it.

Mr. ARENS. What was the attitude of Mr. Hemsley, if you know, toward the employment of Mrs. Knowles on a permanent basis?

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Hemsley was not present at the meeting.

Mr. ARENS. I understand, but do you know what his attitude was toward the employment of Mary Knowles on a permanent basis?

Mr. SHEPPARD. His attitude was in opposition to the employment.

Mr. ARENS. Do you know what the attitude of the other Mr. Sheppard was toward the employment of Mary Knowles on a permanent basis?

Mr. SHEPPARD. His attitude was also in opposition.

Mr. ARENS. Do you know what the attitude was of Mrs. Browning toward the employment of Mary Knowles on a permanent basis?

Mr. SHEPPARD. Only by hearsay, I understand that she was opposed.

Mr. ARENS. Then of the 8 members of the library committee, is it your judgment that 4 were opposed to the employment of Mary Knowles on a permanent basis and 4 were in agreement to the employment of Mary Knowles on a permanent basis?

Mr. SHEPPARD. Yes; that is right.

Mr. ARENS. I will have to ask you in a rather informal way to explain a rule to me that I didn't know a thing about until just the

recent past when I began studying this matter. Is there a rule of unanimity which operates within the Society of Friends whereby major decisions are not arrived at unless there is unanimous agreement on the decision?

Mr. SHEPPARD. Yes; there is.

Mr. ARENS. That governs, I take it—if I am delving into a matter of sacred design that you would rather not answer, say so—I take it that would govern a proposition such as the hiring of an individual; would it not?

Mr. SHEPPARD. It should.

Mr. ARENS. Does the rule of unanimity apply in the Plymouth Monthly Meeting?

Mr. SHEPPARD. I understand that it does.

Mr. ARENS. Does the rule of unanimity or policy or practice of unanimity apply in the library committee?

Mr. SHEPPARD. It did not in this case.

Mr. ARENS. Does it otherwise apply, or did it otherwise apply?

Mr. SHEPPARD. It always had heretofore.

Mr. ARENS. What did you do after you received the announcement from Mrs. Tapley that Mary Knowles was to be employed on a permanent basis?

Mr. SHEPPARD. I announced my opposition and I also announced that under the circumstances I would be forced to resign as a trustee of the Mary R. Miller Fund and as a member of the library committee to be effective September 1, 1954, the reason for the delay being that I wanted my books audited before I turned them over to my successor.

Mr. ARENS. Did you ask that your opposition to the employment of Mary Knowles on a permanent basis be recorded in the minutes of the library committee?

Mr. SHEPPARD. I did.

Mr. ARENS. Was that opposition to your knowledge so recorded?

Mr. SHEPPARD. I have no knowledge whether it was or not.

Mr. ARENS. How long had you been on the library committee?

Mr. SHEPPARD. From about 1927 to 1954—27 years.

Mr. ARENS. During those 27 years, did you ever see the rule of unanimity or the policy of unanimity violated in the library committee?

Mr. SHEPPARD. No; because all of our decisions were reached in a unanimous manner. I mean there was no opposition. They were minor things. Shall we buy certain books? Shall we do this or that? There was never any occasion for what you might call a split vote.

Mr. ARENS. I have asked you this question in another form before, but I want the record absolutely to reflect without any possible doubt what your answer would be to this question: Was either the temporary or the permanent hiring of Mary Knowles ever placed before the members of the Plymouth Monthly Meeting for their approval, to your knowledge?

Mr. SHEPPARD. I have no knowledge of that.

Mr. ARENS. May I ask you this: Do you have knowledge respecting the submission of the permanent or temporary hiring, as the case may be, of Mary Knowles before the Plymouth Monthly Meeting?

Mr. SHEPPARD. I understand that after the action taken by the library committee at this last meeting that I attended, which was

either late July or early August 1954, the matter was placed before the Plymouth Monthly Meeting in October 1954. I have no direct knowledge of that.

Mr. ARENS. Is your information that when the matter was discussed within the Plymouth Monthly Meeting that a majority of the members of the Plymouth Monthly Meeting registered an opposition to the employment of Mary Knowles on a permanent basis?

Mr. SHEPPARD. I have no knowledge of that. I did not attend the meeting.

Mr. ARENS. Have you at any time registered within the Plymouth Monthly Meeting—and here again I suggest to you that if I intrude at any place on a matter of secrecy or sanctity within your religious activities, just please say so and we will get away from that area—but have you registered your opposition to the employment of Mary Knowles on a permanent basis at any time within the Plymouth Monthly Meeting?

Mr. SHEPPARD. I have not attended any of the Plymouth Monthly Meetings at which this question arose. Furthermore, the question of the employment of the librarian, to my knowledge, had never come up before the Plymouth Monthly Meeting before. We had been functioning for twenty-odd years. We had employed two librarians before that without the sanction of the Plymouth Monthly Meeting.

Mr. ARENS. Did you on July 2, 1955, Mr. Sheppard, address a letter to the treasurer of the Plymouth Monthly Meeting, Mr. Frank J. C. Jones, with respect to the question of depositing the award money which was made by the Fund for the Republic?

Mr. SHEPPARD. Yes; I did.

Mr. ARENS. I should like, if I may, please, sir, to lay before you what I understand is a copy of that letter and ask you if that is a true and correct copy of the letter which you sent under that date.

Mr. SHEPPARD (after examining document). Yes; that is.

Mr. ARENS. Did the Plymouth Monthly Meeting at any time to your knowledge accept the award which was made to it by the Fund for the Republic?

Mr. SHEPPARD. No, not to my knowledge; they have not.

Mr. ARENS. May I read, Mr. Chairman, the letter which this gentleman has identified as the one he directed under date of July 2, 1955, to Mr. Jones. Who is Mr. Frank J. C. Jones?

Mr. SHEPPARD. He is the treasurer of the Plymouth Monthly Meeting.

Mr. ARENS (reading):

I am writing to urgently request that the depositing of the check for \$5,000 which is to be presented to the Plymouth Monthly Meeting by the so-called Fund for the Republic (what Republic I do not know) be withheld until this "gift" is either approved or rejected by the Monthly Meeting.

What an insult to loyal American citizens the acceptance of this money would be.

Should the Monthly Meeting or library be rewarded because a minority of the members of the Meeting uphold the employment of a person of questionable loyalty, one who has by the sworn testimony of Herbert Philbrick been a member of a Communist "cell"; one who has hidden behind the fifth amendment and refused to testify regarding her affiliations with the Communist Party; one who has refused to sign a simple oath of loyalty to our country; and one who, when questioned by a member of the library committee regarding possible present connections with the Communist Party or other subversive organizations, refused to answer before the committee, stating that she would never divulge

either her political or religious affiliation? I for one want no further connection with the Plymouth Meeting Society of Friends, and I am confident there are many members of the Meeting who feel likewise. Is the policy of the Monthly Meeting to continue to be dictated by the will of a small minority? Is the policy of Friends to take action only after unanimous agreement to be voided, as it was on the Jeanes Library Committee?

I am reminded of Romans, chapter 16, the 17th and 18th verses, which reads: "Now I beseech you, Brethren, mark them which cause divisions and offences contrary to the doctrine which Ye have learned; and avoid them. For they that are such serve not our Lord Jesus Christ, but their own belly; and by good words and fair speeches deceive the hearts of the simple." I am one of the simple, but am not deceived.

Did you receive a reply from Mr. Jones in response to that letter which I have just read urging him not to accept or to take within his custody the check from the Fund for the Republic?

Mr. SHEPPARD. No; I did not receive a reply from Mr. Jones. I talked to Mr. Jones after having written that letter and he informed me that the check had been taken out of his hands and deposited by, let's say, an overzealous member of the Plymouth Monthly Meeting.

Mr. WEBSTER. Let's say by you.

Mr. ARENS. Mr. Chairman, I respectfully suggest that this person be admonished to contain himself so as not to disrupt the orderly proceeding of this hearing.

The CHAIRMAN. This sort of conduct does not deceive anybody.

Mr. ARENS. Mr. Sheppard, may I ask you, on the basis of your extensive contacts within the community, are you in a position to express to the committee today the general sentiment of the majority of the members of the Plymouth Monthly Meeting with reference to the retaining of Mary Knowles on a permanent basis in the library?

Mr. SHEPPARD. From my observation I think the overwhelming majority of the residents of the community are opposed to the hiring and continuing of Mary Knowles as librarian.

Mr. ARENS. In your judgment, on the basis of your extensive experience and contact in the community with reference to the community itself, what is the general sentiment of the Plymouth Monthly Meeting members themselves?

Mr. SHEPPARD. The only persons who have expressed themselves favorably toward the continued employment of Mary Knowles have been certain members of the Plymouth Monthly Meeting. Everyone else to whom I have talked—I do not bring the subject up to them, they bring it up to me—has been outstandingly opposed to Mary Knowles.

Mr. ARENS. What is the official attitude of the township with respect to the retention of Mary Knowles on a permanent basis in the Plymouth community?

Mr. SHEPPARD. The townships withdrew their annual appropriation to the library, both Plymouth and Whitmarsh Townships, both Plymouth and Whitmarsh School Boards, and the Conshohocken Community Chest.

Mr. ARENS. What is the official attitude of the Community Chest toward the retention on a permanent basis of Mary Knowles?

Mr. SHEPPARD. I think the fact that they withdrew their appropriation expresses their opinion.

Mr. ARENS. What is the official attitude of the school board toward the retention of Mary Knowles as a permanent librarian?

Mr. SHEPPARD. The school board has, I believe, expressed their opinion by forbidding the teachers to take classes to the Jeanes Library for library instruction, and so forth.

Mr. ARENS. On the basis of your extensive experience and as a person who has been an outstanding civic leader in the Plymouth Meeting area, I ask you what is your opinion and your judgment as to the effect within the Plymouth Monthly Meeting group of the award which was tendered to the Plymouth Monthly Meeting by the Fund for the Republic, without solicitation?

Mr. SHEPPARD. I think it has caused considerable dissension among the members of the Plymouth Meeting Society of Friends. I think the Meeting is pretty well split on the issue. The award is in escrow. If the present attitude continues, I think it will remain in escrow for years and years and years.

Mr. ARENS. Do you know whether it was brought to the attention of the young lady who made the investigation in behalf of the Fund for the Republic that some 800 people in the community of Plymouth Meeting, eight-hundred-odd people—I don't have the exact number now, I had it this morning—were protesting the retention of Mary Knowles as librarian?

Mr. SHEPPARD. I have no knowledge of that.

Mr. ARENS. You know, of course, do you not, that such protests were lodged?

Mr. SHEPPARD. Oh, yes.

Mr. ARENS. But you don't know whether or not the fact of the lodging of those protests was brought to the attention of the Fund?

Mr. SHEPPARD. No; I do not.

Mr. ARENS. Do you know that only 28 of the total membership of 108 in 1955 of the Plymouth Monthly Meeting were on record as approving the retention of Mary Knowles?

Mr. SHEPPARD. I didn't know that exact number; no.

Mr. ARENS. Is that approximately correct so far as your recollection?

Mr. SHEPPARD. I think that it would be approximately correct.

Mr. ARENS. That out of 108 in the Plymouth Monthly Meeting only 28 are on record as approving the retention of Mary Knowles?

Mr. SHEPPARD. I think that would be approximately correct.

Mr. ARENS. What has this award of the Fund for the Republic done for this spirit of unanimity and this policy of unanimity which I understood has been the prevalent attitude and practice in the Plymouth Monthly Meeting of the Religious Society of Friends?

Mr. SHEPPARD. I think temporarily at least it has destroyed it.

Mr. ARENS. Do you have any information that the Plymouth Monthly Meeting made an investigation, a thorough investigation of Mary Knowles as, I say parenthetically, was reported in the report of the gentleman from the Fund for the Republic?

Mr. SHEPPARD. I have no information about any investigation made of Mary Knowles except Mary Knowles' own statement to the library committee.

Mr. ARENS. Were you present when Mary Knowles was interrogated by the library committee itself?

Mr. SHEPPARD. I was present when she was interrogated for the position of temporary or substitute librarian.

Mr. ARENS. Were you present when she was interrogated with respect to possible permanent employment?

Mr. SHEPPARD. No, I was not.

Mr. ARENS. Mr. Sheppard, I have asked you, as is quite obvious, a considerable number of questions here. I want to ask if there are any other items of information pertaining to the subject matter under scrutiny by this committee which you would like to bring to the attention of the committee and recite for this record.

Mr. SHEPPARD. There is only one thing, Mr. Arens. I have heard the minutes of the library committee read for twenty-seven-odd years, and to my recollection there has never been anything of a purely religious nature in those minutes. That has been strictly library business.

Mr. ARENS. Mr. Chairman, I respectfully suggest that this concludes the staff interrogation of this witness.

The CHAIRMAN. In view of the fact that it has been very generally known that this contribution, if that is what it is, was not accepted, the thing I can't understand is why the Fund has not requested that it be returned. Has there ever been any request made to return this money which is not being used?

Mr. SHEPPARD. I don't know, Mr. Walter.

The CHAIRMAN. Any questions?

Mr. SCHERER. I have no questions.

Mr. WEBSTER. May I ask a few questions?

The CHAIRMAN. The witness is excused.

Mr. WEBSTER. Mr. Chairman, may I ask a few questions?

The CHAIRMAN. No. You have interrupted us quite enough.

Mr. SCHERER. Mr. Chairman——

Mr. WEBSTER. In view of the witness' very distressing exposure today——

The CHAIRMAN. You will have your opportunity.

Mr. WEBSTER. I should like an opportunity——

The CHAIRMAN. You will have your opportunity.

Mr. SCHERER. Mr. Webster, one member of this committee at least feels that you have been in contempt of this committee. You have interrupted without right. You have so interrupted on four different occasions and have been admonished by the chairman of this committee. You are an eminent member of the bar. You know the rules of the committee. And your conduct has certainly been contemptuous.

The CHAIRMAN. It is quite familiar.

Mr. WEBSTER. May I answer that?

The CHAIRMAN. The committee is in recess for 5 minutes.

(Brief recess.)

The CHAIRMAN. Call your next witness.

(Members of the committee present: Representatives Walter and Scherer.)

Mr. ARENS. Mr. Henry Hemsley, please come forward.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Hemsley?

Do you swear or affirm that the testimony you are about to give is the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth?

Mr. HEMSLEY. I do.

TESTIMONY OF HENRY HEMSLEY

Mr. ARENS. Will you kindly identify yourself, if you please, sir, by name, residence, and occupation.

Mr. HEMSLEY. Henry Hemsley, 513 Plymouth Road, Plymouth Township, Pa.

Mr. ARENS. Mr. Hemsley, do you hold any public office?

Mr. HEMSLEY. Yes. I am at the present time a commissioner, chairman of the Board of Commissioners of Plymouth Township.

Mr. ARENS. How long have you occupied that post?

Mr. HEMSLEY. I have been chairman of the board since 1950.

Mr. ARENS. Were you a member of the library committee of the William Jeanes Memorial Library?

Mr. HEMSLEY. Yes, sir.

Mr. ARENS. Were you a member of the library committee by virtue of your office as a commissioner of Plymouth Township?

Mr. HEMSLEY. Yes, sir; by the appropriation of money the board appointed two of us commissioners.

Mr. ARENS. Are you presently a member of the library committee?

Mr. HEMSLEY. No, I am not.

Mr. ARENS. When did your service to the library committee terminate?

Mr. HEMSLEY. I think it would be our action of November 15, 1954, that the board of commissioners withheld appropriation from the library until further notice, therefore terminating my trusteeship as a trustee.

Mr. ARENS. Can you tell us how long you were on the library committee?

Mr. HEMSLEY. Approximately I think it was the third year. We made 2 years' appropriation, and the third year in November of 1954 it was withheld.

Mr. ARENS. How long have you personally, as a citizen of the Plymouth community, maintained an interest in the library and undertaken to promote its welfare?

Mr. HEMSLEY. I would say it goes back 10 or 12 years. At one time I was cochairman on the community chest and at that time I got very much interested in the library, its financial support.

Mr. ARENS. Prior to the fall of 1954, the period in which I understood you to say you resigned from the library, could you tell the committee what outside contributions or funds were received by the library?

Mr. HEMSLEY. The community chest. At one time I think the appropriation was in the neighborhood of \$500.

Mr. ARENS. Per year?

Mr. HEMSLEY. For a given year. The school board I understand appropriated approximately \$100 from both Plymouth and Whitemarsh Townships. Whitemarsh matched our fund of \$500 which was given by the board of commissioners. It being a joint community library, I had spoken to several and I think our friend Isaac Sheppard had some influence too, as to getting Whitemarsh to do likewise, appropriating \$500 annually.

Mr. ARENS. Are those funds and is that support presently being contributed toward the library by these sources which you have just enumerated?

Mr. HEMSLEY. No, not one of them.

Mr. ARENS. What occasioned the fact that this support is no longer being contributed to the library?

Mr. HEMSLEY. The fact of Mrs. Mary Knowles was basically the reason for withdrawing the appropriation.

Mr. ARENS. To your knowledge did the Plymouth School Board take any action toward instructing the teachers in any manner pertaining to the library?

Mr. HEMSLEY. Yes. They have forbidden——

Mr. ARENS. What action was taken there?

Mr. HEMSLEY. The school board I understand, with only one dissenting vote, at the following meeting which we held—a public meeting at which we heard the library committee—the board of commissioners I am now referring to of Plymouth Township. October 11, 1954, we held a public hearing and Mrs. Chapple was the spokesman for the library committee. We held a lengthy discussion, and one of the school board members who happened to be present at the board of commissioners asked if he could stay. I said, “Yes, you would be most welcome,” that any one was welcome to stay at our hearings. The following night, which would be September 13, no—I think it was, but let me check my minutes. The hearing was October 11, so October 12, 1954, the school board had a meeting and Dr. Kirkpatrick, who is a member of that school board, brought it to the attention of the school board and at that meeting the school board withheld its appropriation and also forbade its teachers and the children to use the library under the guidance of the teachers.

Mr. ARENS. As a former member of the library committee can you tell us whether or not the library committee in its meetings met on a fixed day each month or did it, on the other hand, meet just occasionally upon call and upon notice?

Mr. HEMSLEY. I know for a fact that when Mrs. Sawyer was librarian we always received a card about a week prior to the meeting, but after Mrs. Sawyer's illness and during her temporary unemployment, while she was ill, sometimes Mrs. Tapley, who was chairman of the committee, would undertake to call us for a special meeting.

Mr. ARENS. Did you personally receive any notice of a meeting, Mr. Hemsley, of the library committee for the purpose of engaging a substitute librarian after Mrs. Sawyer injured herself in her fall?

Mr. HEMSLEY. At one trustee meeting after Mrs. Sawyer fell and broke her hip, it was brought up that we were to advertise in the local guild to hire a librarian, but the meeting was set for that following Thursday. I think it was the third Thursday in the month. It was either the second or third. But I was not present when Mrs. Knowles was hired.

Mr. ARENS. You are speaking of temporary hiring?

Mr. HEMSLEY. That is right, the temporary hiring of Mrs. Knowles.

Mr. ARENS. When Mrs. Knowles was hired on a permanent basis did you in advance of that event receive a notice?

Mr. HEMSLEY. No, sir.

Mr. ARENS. Do you know whether or not Lewis Sheppard, one of your board members, received a notice?

Mr. HEMSLEY. He told me himself he had not received any notice of that meeting.

Mr. ARENS. Had you, prior to that time, registered your views in opposition to the permanent hiring of Mary Knowles?

Mr. HEMSLEY. Quite frequently.

Mr. ARENS. Had Lewis Sheppard registered his opposition prior to the meeting?

Mr. HEMSLEY. At one meeting of the trustees I attended, yes; he was opposed to it.

Mr. ARENS. Did you and Mr. Sheppard customarily receive notices of the meetings scheduled to be held, except in this instance?

Mr. HEMSLEY. Except in this instance. I can speak for myself. Mr. Sheppard I couldn't speak for, other than the fact that he did verify, when I asked him if he received notice and he said he had not.

Mr. ARENS. Under what circumstances and how did you first hear or gain knowledge that Mary Knowles had been hired permanently by the library board or library committee?

Mr. HEMSLEY. Through Mr. Isaac Sheppard, who is a member of the board, at my place of business.

Mr. ARENS. Before we proceed further in the chronology of events concerning which I should like to interrogate you, if you please, sir, do you have knowledge respecting the treatment accorded Mrs. Sawyer after she had resumed her permanent position as librarian?

Mr. HEMSLEY. After her illness, you mean?

Mr. ARENS. Yes.

Mr. HEMSLEY. Yes; I do.

Mr. ARENS. Can you, just in your own words, recount to this committee the treatment, if you know, which was accorded Mrs. Sawyer after she resumed her permanent employment as librarian?

Mr. HEMSLEY. All indications—particularly Ray Riday who was a member of the library committee—drew up a set of rules and regulations in regard to governing Mrs. Sawyer's return, the things they should do and the things that she shouldn't do. I said, "I think it is very unusual and unfair after 14 years of service that we have to put things in writing."

He said, "Henry, we would like to replace Mrs. Sawyer when her contract expires as of September 19—" I may be wrong in these dates, 1953 or 1954, when her annual contract expired.

I said, "Then, in other words, you are planning on replacing Mrs. Sawyer?" He said, "Yes. Until we do we want the library run the way it has when Mrs. Knowles had it temporarily."

Mr. ARENS. During the course of your service on the library committee, do you care to give an appraisal of the efficiency and competency of Mrs. Sawyer as a librarian?

Mr. HEMSLEY. I think she did a wonderful job after all these years, but as we progress we all know there are new methods and ideas. I think we all had in mind that some day Mrs. Sawyer would retire, but generally speaking for myself, I didn't hope to have part of pushing her out.

Mr. ARENS. In your judgment, was she pushed out?

Mr. HEMSLEY. Yes.

Mr. ARENS. Was she pushed out by those people on the library committee who were instrumental in engaging Mary Knowles as the librarian?

Mr. HEMSLEY. I think some tactics were used that aren't commonly engaged in, in everyday form of life.

Mr. ARENS. Did you attend a library committee meeting following the one in which Mary Knowles was engaged permanently?

Mr. HEMSLEY. Yes.

Mr. ARENS. Where and when was this meeting held?

Mr. HEMSLEY. The meeting was held in the home of Mrs. Tapley on Plymouth Road. The time—I think if I can explain myself, it was my whole desire to keep all undue publicity—the public from realizing any part of Mrs. Knowles because I did sit when she was temporarily hired at some of the meetings at the library and Mrs. Knowles was a very efficient librarian. That I will verify. But I did not know of her Communist activities or background of her past until Mr. Isaac Sheppard brought my attention to it after she had been rehired permanently. At that meeting at Mrs. Tapley's which was prior to October 11, 1954—I think it was in the early fall and I know the place was Mrs. Tapley's—but exactly the month, the date, I can't verify because I have no minutes of that particular meeting. But I could name you the committee who were present at the meeting.

Mr. ARENS. Just tell us in essence what happened at this meeting which followed the meeting in which Mary Knowles was employed permanently.

Mr. HEMSLEY. She opened the meeting and Mrs. Knowles was present. I said, "Mrs. Knowles, there are a few questions I would like to ask and I hope you don't think that I am being too personal or dominating." I said, "We are just a small community trying to help the library."

I said, "Unfortunately, I happen to be a commissioner and there is a question of a loyalty oath involved." I said, "Perhaps, maybe, we could overlook it. It has been brought to my attention that in the past you were a member of the Communist Party." To that she made no reply. Then following that I said, "Mrs. Knowles, are you now a member of the Communist Party?" To which I received no reply.

It sort of—well, to break it a little bit, to try to make the woman at ease, I took it for granted she was a Christian woman, being the Friends Society engaged her and Mrs. Tapley on whom I relied for quite a number of years. I asked her, "Are you a Christian woman?" and at that Mrs. Knowles said her political, her religious life was none of my business or anyone else's.

At that she picked up her folder and left the room.

Mr. ARENS. Did you thereafter call to the attention of the Plymouth Township commissioners the events which had transpired up to this point?

Mr. HEMSLEY. I did.

Mr. ARENS. Tell us what happened insofar as action was concerned by the Plymouth Township commissioners.

Mr. HEMSLEY. After our public hearing on October 11, it was on September 13 that we had a lengthy discussion in regard to Mrs. Knowles. One of the commissioners in particular was Ray Brodwick, who now has left the township—he sort of impressed on me that maybe this woman was unduly accused. Therefore we secured this copy of the Jenner committee—

Mr. ARENS. That is the Senate committee?

Mr. HEMSLEY. The committee that investigated Mrs. Knowles. I understand some members of the library committee had that report, although I had never seen it, when they temporarily hired Mrs.

Knowles. So after the discussion at the board of commissioners, Ray Brodwick felt more time should be allowed to get the overall picture so the commissioners did not unjustly accuse this woman of her past.

So no action was taken. There was open discussion. There was no action taken until our November meeting, November 15, 1954. On the motion of myself to the board of commissioners, which Lew Sheppard, a fellow trustee, seconded, it was the unanimous decision that we withhold the appropriation from the library committee.

Mr. ARENS. Now may I ask you to explain in your own words—I have also asked this question of Mr. Sheppard, but I want to have the record clear on your judgment—did the Plymouth Monthly Meeting at any time employ Mary Knowles?

Mr. HEMSLEY. To my knowledge; no.

In fact, I was always under the impression that the library was a separate function from the Monthly Meeting.

Mr. ARENS. That is the next question I was going to ask you. Was the library committee separate, what we lawyers would call autonomous?

Mr. HEMSLEY. I never knew—in the 3 years I was trustee—of any question that was ever raised about the Friends Meeting.

Mr. ARENS. How many people were on the library committee when Mary Knowles was hired?

Mr. HEMSLEY. Eight of us.

Mr. ARENS. How many were for the hiring of Mary Knowles on a permanent basis?

Mr. HEMSLEY. To my knowledge I can't recall other than the fact that I know the ones who were not present. I have never seen the minutes nor heard the minutes read at a meeting.

Mr. ARENS. Did you know that of the eight, your brother was opposed to the hiring of Mary Knowles? Was Lewis Sheppard opposed to hiring Mary Knowles?

Mr. HEMSLEY. Yes; because we had a meeting and when I asked Mrs. Knowles if she had ever had any Communist connections, Lew Sheppard was present at that meeting.

Mr. ARENS. Did you know that Lew Sheppard's brother was opposed to the hiring of Mary Knowles?

Mr. HEMSLEY. Yes.

Mr. ARENS. Did you know that Mrs. Browning was opposed to the hiring of Mary Knowles?

Mr. HEMSLEY. Yes.

Mr. ARENS. And you, of course, were opposed to the hiring of Mary Knowles?

Mr. HEMSLEY. Yes.

Mr. ARENS. Then hiring of Mary Knowles was by four people; is that correct?

Mr. HEMSLEY. That is right, sir.

Mr. ARENS. And it is an abstract that the Plymouth Meeting did not hire Mary Knowles?

Mr. HEMSLEY. As far as my knowledge they never hired her.

Mr. ARENS. Did the Plymouth Monthly Meeting to your knowledge ever confirm the hiring of Mary Knowles?

Mr. HEMSLEY. No.

Mr. ARENS. You are a member of the Society of Friends?

Mr. HEMSLEY. No; I am not.

Mr. ARENS. You are not a member of the Society of Friends?

Mr. HEMSLEY. No; I have very high regard for them.

Mr. ARENS. I understand. You are not a member of the Plymouth Monthly Meeting, then?

Mr. HEMSLEY. No; I am a member of the Cold Point Baptist Church.

Mr. ARENS. On the basis of your background and experience in this community, would you care to express to this committee what the prevailing sentiment was in May of 1955 with respect to the hiring on a permanent basis of Mary Knowles?

Mr. HEMSLEY. Any people I had any contact with seemed to raise the question as to why a controversial issue in a small community—if there was any question on a person's reference she was to be hired. There seemed to be a question outside the meeting—I am not talking about the Friends Society; I am talking about a public in general—as to why you hire someone whose character was in question to be put in public trust.

Mr. ARENS. After the action that you have described by the commissioners did anyone on behalf of the library committee request a hearing for the committee?

Mr. HEMSLEY. Yes.

Mr. ARENS. Was that hearing held?

Mr. HEMSLEY. Yes.

Mr. ARENS. Tell us in your own words, if you know, what happened.

Mr. HEMSLEY. Mrs. Chapple was the spokesman for the group. All of us, I think, were under the impression that Mrs. Chapple was coming with the library committee to state their side, their views as to why they hired Mrs. Knowles. But to our surprise there were approximately 30 or 40 people who attended this meeting. So we adjourned the meeting and held it in the large outside auditorium.

Mr. ARENS. When did the Plymouth Township Commissioners vote to withdraw their contribution to the library? November 15, 1954, was it not?

Mr. HEMSLEY. Yes.

Mr. ARENS. Do you recall the essence of the resolution which was passed by the Plymouth Township Commissioners as to why they were withdrawing their support of the library?

Mr. HEMSLEY. Yes. Basically it was due to the librarian failing to answer certain questions and also failing to sign a loyalty oath, that the appropriation was withheld. It was a unanimous vote of the five commissioners.

Mr. ARENS. Now I want to allude to language which already has been identified in the record from a document which we call by label the Sprogell memorandum, "Ogden Exhibit No. 1," that "the Meeting," the Plymouth Monthly Meeting, "conducted a careful investigation into her"—I use parentheses (Mary Knowles)—"conduct since 1947."

To your knowledge, did the Plymouth Monthly Meeting conduct a careful investigation as to Mary Knowles' conduct since 1947?

Mr. HEMSLEY. Only what you hear in the papers and radio; I had no personal contact with anyone.

Mr. ARENS. The Sprogell memorandum, Ogden Exhibit No. 1, also says on page 2 that the opposition to Mary Knowles' engagement on a

permanent basis was by a small, determined group in the community. In your judgment, was the opposition by a small, determined group, or was the proportion a little bit different?

Mr. HEMSLEY. To my way of thinking and from the public opinion, I think it was a rather broad issue.

Mr. ARENS. Are you conversant with a resolution which was passed by the Casey-Sheppard Post 895, of the American Legion, of Plymouth Township respecting Mary Knowles?

Mr. HEMSLEY. Yes; I saw a copy. I had a copy of that shown to me.

Mr. ARENS. I lay before you now, if you please, sir, a resolution and ask you if that is the resolution which was passed by this post of the American Legion.

Mr. HEMSLEY. Yes; this is the resolution.

Mr. ARENS. Do you recall approximately when that was passed?

Mr. HEMSLEY. I think it was shortly after the action of the board of commissioners.

Mr. ARENS. Does this resolution vigorously oppose the engagement of Mary Knowles—

Mr. HEMSLEY. Yes; it does.

Mr. ARENS. Until such time as the matter of her loyalty to our country has been cleared up by the proper authorities.

Mr. HEMSLEY. Yes, sir.

Mr. ARENS. Was this resolution a matter of public property at the time that the representative of the Fund for the Republic came into this community to investigate whether or not the Sprogell report was true?

Mr. HEMSLEY. Yes. That resolution, if I remember correctly, was published in the local newspaper.

Mr. ARENS. Do you also have information, sir, respecting the action taken by the Valley Forge Chapter of the Daughters of the American Revolution with respect to this matter?

Mr. HEMSLEY. Yes; I had a copy of that sent to me in the mail.

Mr. ARENS. What was the essence of the position and announcement of the Daughters of the American Revolution on that matter?

Mr. HEMSLEY. Almost identically the same as the Casey-Sheppard Post. They were opposed.

Mr. ARENS. Was that a matter of public property?

Mr. HEMSLEY. Yes.

Mr. ARENS. Was that available prior to the time that the young lady from the Fund arrived to make this study to check on the accuracy or truthfulness of the Sprogell memorandum?

Mr. HEMSLEY. I think it was, sir.

Mr. ARENS. After the action of the township committee which you have described, did any member of the library committee invite you to meet with the committee to enlist your aid for the restoration of the township's contribution?

Mr. HEMSLEY. Yes.

Mr. ARENS. What happened?

Mr. HEMSLEY. I think it was on a Sunday afternoon I was invited to attend a meeting at the library of some members of the committee—it is a little vague in my mind—at the time for the purpose, after the meeting progressed—I thought it was a regular committee meeting of the library, but if I recall, Mrs. Tapley was there, Miss Ambler,

there was a lawyer. I don't know whether his name was Sprogell. There were quite a few people. While the meeting was in progress I got the impression that they were soliciting, trying to get me more or less to endorse Mrs. Knowles. I think Lew Sheppard was there, because Lew brought out the fact that if Mrs. Knowles signed a loyalty oath, he would be satisfied. I was maybe a little more in opposition to it.

Mr. ARENS. May I intervene with this question: By the loyalty oath do you mean the Pennsylvania loyalty oath?

Mr. HEMSLEY. Yes, sir; the Pennsylvania loyalty oath which all public officials are supposed to sign.

Mr. SCHERER. Is that under the laws of Pennsylvania?

Mr. HEMSLEY. Yes.

Mr. ARENS. She declined to sign that?

Mr. HEMSLEY. Yes, sir.

Mr. ARENS. Did you address a question to Mary Knowles at that session?

Mr. HEMSLEY. I can't recall now whether Mary Knowles was even at that session. I don't think Mary Knowles was at that session.

Mr. ARENS. Did you thereafter address a question to Mary Knowles respecting whether or not she was a Communist?

Mr. HEMSLEY. Oh, yes; at Mrs. Tapley's home, at a trustee meeting.

Mr. ARENS. Tell us where and when that meeting took place. You said Mrs. Tapley's home. Now tell us when.

Mr. HEMSLEY. It was some time in the early fall, prior to the meeting when Mrs. Chapple attended—the commissioners—for a public hearing.

Mr. ARENS. Did you at that session address a question to Mary Knowles?

Mr. HEMSLEY. Yes, sir.

Mr. ARENS. What was the question you addressed to her?

Mr. HEMSLEY. I asked her if she had been a former member of the Communist Party.

Mr. ARENS. What was the response she made?

Mr. HEMSLEY. No reply.

Mr. ARENS. Did you address any other question to her?

Mr. HEMSLEY. I asked Mrs. Knowles if she was now a member of the Communist Party.

Mr. ARENS. And what reply did she give you?

Mr. HEMSLEY. I received no answer.

Mr. ARENS. Did you address any other questions to her?

Mr. HEMSLEY. Yes. I asked Mrs. Knowles—I said, "Apparently we seem to be very dominating. Perhaps if I could phrase something that if you are a Christian woman then we would be lesser Christians if we didn't support you regardless of your past. If you are willing to help yourself, then perhaps we can help you now."

Mr. ARENS. Your attitude was one, I take it, if I am not mistaken in construing it, of one of seeking to rehabilitate a person who may have been enmeshed in the Communist conspiracy?

Mr. HEMSLEY. Rather than a persecutor.

Mr. ARENS. The committee does that all the time, I advise you, trying to rehabilitate people.

Mr. HEMSLEY. In our own way we were trying to help the woman, not to persecute her in any way, shape, or form.

Mr. ARENS. Then what happened?

Mr. HEMSLEY. At that Mrs. Knowles stated that her political and religious life was her own personal affairs and therefore picked up her folder and left the room. The only time I ever heard religion brought into the question of the library in all the time I served on it was at the same meeting at Mrs. Tapley's home when the question was raised about the Stars and Stripes, I think an Army magazine, being on display in the library. Miss Ambler I think raised the question.

Mr. ARENS. Did you or any member of your family receive any communications in a threatening vein because of your opposition to the retention of Mary Knowles?

Mr. HEMSLEY. Yes; I received two anonymous letters. They were not signed.

Mr. ARENS. Tell us the vein of those, if you please, sir.

Mr. HEMSLEY. More or less felt that I was using my position to persecute an innocent woman and what right did I have to question her background when she was already proven by the library committee to be very adequate. Neither letter was signed. I did receive them through the mail and received several phone calls which were anonymous likewise.

Mr. ARENS. What is the size of the community serviced by this library?

Mr. HEMSLEY. You mean the area involved?

Mr. ARENS. Yes. How many people would you say would be patrons of the library?

Mr. HEMSLEY. Three or four thousand.

Mr. ARENS. Of this 3,000 or 4,000, how many to your knowledge have actually signed petitions protesting the retention on a permanent basis of Mary Knowles?

Mr. HEMSLEY. The last report I had from Mrs. Philip Corson was approximately between 800 or 850.

Mr. ARENS. How many to your knowledge have registered themselves in favor of the retention of Mary Knowles?

Mr. HEMSLEY. That I have no matter of record.

Mr. ARENS. What is your judgment as to the general opinion and feeling within the community, as you see it, and not through your work and through your associations, with reference to the retention on a permanent basis of Mary Knowles?

Mr. HEMSLEY. You want my own personal feelings?

Mr. ARENS. Yes, sir.

Mr. HEMSLEY. I think it is very detrimental to the community to divide a community of such long standing. To be honest, I have heard quite a few say "let your conscience be your guide." To me I cannot see Mrs. Knowles putting a value on a librarian job, regardless of the amount of money involved, that would divide a community of such old traditions and standings, to separate families and people, and let no one fool you, it is divided.

No job to me, in my own personal opinion, regardless of the amount of money involved, is justifiable to split a community.

Mr. ARENS. What has been the effect of this whole proceeding upon Mrs. Sawyer, who served the library so faithfully for so many years?

Mr. HEMSLEY. I imagine it would be a very trying ordeal after serving a number of years in a community, giving your best, and then at

the last moment through accident to have a committee, one or more of that committee, to indicate they would like for you to quit. Although perhaps there is no written record of it, Mrs. Sawyer did phone me and express that she had been called on by various members of the committee who thought she should quit and get out for the good of the library.

Mr. ARENS. Was that during her illness?

Mr. HEMSLEY. Yes; while she was in bed.

Mr. ARENS. I respectfully suggest that concludes the staff interrogation of this witness.

The CHAIRMAN. Any questions?

Mr. SCHIERER. Just one.

Did any one representing the Fund for the Republic, when it was making its investigation of this controversy in your community, contact you?

Mr. HEMSLEY. No, sir.

Mr. SCHIERER. Did you receive a questionnaire from the Fund for the Republic to fill out? Were you sent a questionnaire by the Fund for the Republic?

Mr. HEMSLEY. No, I received none.

Mr. SCHIERER. I have no further questions.

The CHAIRMAN. Does this library committee keep minutes of its meetings?

Mr. HEMSLEY. Yes, sir; for the last—while I was on up until—even when Mrs. Sawyer was on she more or less gave a written report, but I never actually received a copy, which is customary. In the Lions Club and various other associations if you are a member of the board or a member of the executive committee you receive a copy of the minutes. I never received any, although some were read by Miss Ambler. I never actually received a copy or have known it to be a fact of minutes kept at the trustees meetings.

The CHAIRMAN. Was there anything of a religious nature in the minutes of the library committee?

Mr. HEMSLEY. I never heard the question of religion brought up in all the time I was trustee, until the hiring of Mrs. Knowles and then religion became very prominent.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you very much, Mr. Hemsley.

Call your next witness, Mr. Arens.

Mr. ARENS. Judge George C. Corson, kindly come forward.

The CHAIRMAN. Will you raise your right hand, please. Do you affirm that the evidence you give will be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

Judge CORSON. I do so affirm.

TESTIMONY OF JUDGE GEORGE C. CORSON

Mr. ARENS. Kindly identify yourself, sir, by name, residence, and occupation.

Judge CORSON. Let me say first that I have a very bad throat. I will do the best I can, but I have had some trouble.

George C. Corson, Butler Pike and Plymouth Road, Cold Point, Pa. Post office, Plymouth Meeting. I live between Cold Point Baptist Church on the hill and the Plymouth Meeting on the other end of the

street. And I am a judge by occupation, profession, whatever it may be.

Mr. ARENS. Just in passing, in which court do you preside?

Judge CORSON. The Court of Common Pleas of the 38th Judicial District of Pennsylvania.

Mr. ARENS. Judge, are you a birthright Quaker as was the gentleman who preceded you at the stand a little while ago?

Judge CORSON. A fourth generation birthright Quaker and my son is a fifth generation birthright Quaker.

Mr. ARENS. Are you a member of the Plymouth Monthly Meeting?

Judge CORSON. I have been since birth.

Mr. ARENS. Have all four generations of your family been members of the Plymouth Monthly Meeting?

Judge CORSON. On both sides.

Mr. ARENS. Judge, do you recall having a conversation with Mr. Isaac Sheppard in February of 1954 respecting the desire of certain members of the library committee to replace Mrs. Sawyer, the regular librarian who had been temporarily incapacitated?

Judge CORSON. Yes.

Mr. ARENS. Can you tell us, in your own words, what transpired in that regard?

Judge CORSON. Well, I can't tell exactly what happened with regard to that, except that Mr. Sheppard was so worried that he wanted me to suggest to the Monthly Meeting at its next meeting that the Meeting surrender any connection with the library and turn it over to the Orphans Court of Montgomery County to let the Orphans Court appoint trustees and take any stigma that might be attached to Communist associations and things of that kind.

Mr. ARENS. Did the Plymouth Monthly Meeting concern itself about that time with the question as to whether or not Mrs. Sawyer should be reengaged on a permanent basis?

Judge CORSON. There was a meeting and at that meeting there was considerable discussion.

Mr. ARENS. What was the consensus of opinion of the members of the Meeting? I say to you now, Judge, as I said to the other gentlemen: If I, in any sense, intrude on anything of a religious nature or anything which is in the confidence of your denomination, just decline to speak up on that point and we will proceed on something else.

Judge CORSON. I stated to the Meeting that I felt that, in any event, Mrs. Sawyer should be allowed to serve out the term of her contract which ended for that year in September, I believe, 1954. That was finally agreed to.

Mr. ARENS. That was the consensus of opinion of the Meeting?

Judge CORSON. Yes; so found by the clerk.

Mr. ARENS. Judge, can you, in your words, as a lawyer express in succinct form the relationship between the Plymouth Monthly Meeting and the library committee from the standpoint of autonomy of the committee?

Judge CORSON. They are absolutely distinct. The library was created under the will of Mary Miller—she was named Miller when she died, the widow of William Jeanes. She left \$80,000 to build a library and the balance to be for endowment, preferably to be built upon the grounds of the Plymouth Monthly Meeting. This was done,

and also in the deed of trust or the will, as it was, it was provided certain rights in Plymouth Meeting to appoint members of the committee having charge of the administration and operation of the library. That is the only connection of the Meeting. The Meeting does not under the will have the power to hire or fire anyone.

Mr. ARENS. Did the Plymouth Monthly Meeting—this is the same question I asked you that I have asked other witnesses—you are a lawyer and a judge and I think your testimony on this point would be of importance on this record—did the Plymouth Monthly Meeting at any time hire Mary Knowles?

Judge CORSON. Not only it did not, but it could not under any consideration have done so. They could not spend the Meeting's money to take the place of money that is provided under the will of Mary Jeanes Miller.

Mr. ARENS. Did the Plymouth Monthly Meeting at any time confirm the employment of Mary Knowles?

Judge CORSON. There was a lot of discussion, but I would never know what the minutes would show. I remember on one occasion somebody suggested 2 for and 2 against Mary Knowles be appointed as a committee to investigate. When the clerk read the minutes it was, it had been suggested that 2 people who believe in Friends' principles and 2 people who do not believe in Friends' principles be appointed as the committee. That was the change made after the suggestion. So I couldn't tell what the minutes would say.

Mr. ARENS. A reward, as you know, Judge, or a gift of \$5,000 was directed to the Plymouth Monthly Meeting by the Fund for the Republic. You know that, do you not?

Judge CORSON. Yes.

Mr. ARENS. Did the Plymouth Monthly Meeting, which you say never hired Mary Knowles, never confirmed the hiring of Mary Knowles, ever accept the award which was directed to it by the Fund for the Republic?

Mr. SCHERER. Did you say "reward"?

Mr. ARENS. Award. If I said "reward" that was a slip of the tongue.

Judge CORSON. It never has been so accepted, although there have been many very bitter battles over such question. I might say also that it was said in one letter written by Carroll Corson that one member of the Meeting had taken the check from Frank Jones and cashed it. That is not, I believe, true. The member of the Meeting in question received the check from somebody and, rather than turn it over to the treasurer, he took it to the Conshohocken Bank and endorsed it for deposit to the credit of the treasurer of Plymouth Meeting. That is the way it got into the Meeting's account, and the treasurer knew nothing about it.

Mr. ARENS. In the so-called Sprogeell memorandum, which is marked "Ogden Exhibit No. 1" of this particular record, it is stated that the Plymouth Monthly Meeting made a careful investigation into Mary Knowles' conduct since 1947. Is that true?

Judge CORSON. The Meeting as such never did so, and the only suggestion that it should do so was the appointment of a committee of four, two of which were to be for and two against, which was ignored and nothing happened.

Mr. ARENS. This so-called Sprogeell memorandum, Ogden Exhibit No. 1, likewise says that the opposition or, as they say here, the onslaught against the retention of Mary Knowles comes from a small determined group in the community. Is that a true statement or is it false?

Judge CORSON. It came from within the Meeting from one of the leaders of the Meeting, the person who has spoken and been the spiritual leader for many, many years, Mrs. Shoemaker, and many others in the Meeting. At one time there were 61 members, I understand, out of 108 who petitioned for her removal.

Mr. ARENS. Would you give us that last statistic again?

Judge CORSON. 61 out of 108 members.

Mr. ARENS. 61 out of 108 members of the Plymouth Monthly Meeting petitioned for the removal of Mary Knowles; is that correct?

Judge CORSON. That is correct.

Mr. ARENS. How many of the remaining members have expressed themselves in any kind of petition on the subject matter?

Judge CORSON. None that I know of in a petition. They certainly expressed themselves loud and long.

Mr. ARENS. Are a majority of the members of the Plymouth Monthly Meeting opposed to the retention of Mary Knowles?

Judge CORSON. In my opinion, absolutely.

Mr. ARENS. Now, sir, I lay before you a document entitled "My Suggestions on the Jeanes Library Controversy," proposed by Edith C. Shoemaker. This was alluded to this morning during the testimony of Mrs. Ogden. Have you ever seen that document before?

Judge CORSON. I have not only seen it, but I heard it read to the Meeting at the time it was read by Mrs. Shoemaker.

Mr. ARENS. Mrs. Shoemaker in that document voices strenuous opposition to the retention of Mary Knowles, does she not?

Judge CORSON. There is no question about that.

Mr. ARENS. What is Mrs. Shoemaker's general station or general position within the community of the Society of Friends?

Judge CORSON. Up to the time this happened she was the most respected member of Plymouth Monthly Meeting of Friends. She was leader of the council, the spiritual council of ministers and elders of the Meeting. She has since resigned, I believe, from that as a result of the treatment she has received since this award of the Fund for the Republic.

Mr. ARENS. Judge, do you recall presenting a circular letter of February 15, 1955, with two-hundred-and-forty-odd, 242 or 248, signatures requesting that Mary Knowles be replaced?

Judge CORSON. I presented a petition, and I believe there were that many names upon it. It was handed to me immediately before I went into the meeting by someone. I have forgotten whom. It was given to the clerk and it was summarily stated that it would be turned over to the library committee for consideration and that was the last heard of it.

Mr. ARENS. In passing, may I ask whether or not you were ever interviewed by a representative of the Fund for the Republic prior to the time that the award was tendered to Plymouth Monthly Meeting—

Judge CORSON. I never heard of the award.

Mr. ARENS. For retaining Mary Knowles, which it didn't do?

Judge CORSON. I never heard of the award until I saw it in the papers that there was a meeting to be held to accept it. But there was

a statement here that the Meeting was told of the award, but what they were told was this, that they were being considered for an award.

Mr. ARENS. And was the reason for it explained?

Judge CORSON. No. It may have been. Maybe Mrs. Tapley can tell. But at the time they said we were being considered I feel sure the award had been made. But they were afraid to bring it up at this time because—well, I don't know.

Mr. ARENS. Judge, may I invite your attention specifically to this exhibit which I am now laying before you allegedly, according to the face of the exhibit, bearing the signatures of 248 people requesting that Mary Knowles be removed. Did you read that petition to the Plymouth Monthly Meeting?

Judge CORSON. I did, with a list of names.

Mr. ARENS. Did this petition have appended to it the names of 248 people who were protesting?

Judge CORSON. I did not count the names, but that was the statement that was made and there was no question raised about the number by anyone.

Mr. ARENS. Judge, in April of 1955 did your cousin, Martha Sheron, circulate a petition on the Mary Knowles matter?

Judge CORSON. I am not sure as to that, whether that was the one that had the 61 names on it or not.

Mr. ARENS. I lay before you now, if you please, sir, another exhibit which purports on its face to be a petition calling for the removal of Mary Knowles from her post as permanent librarian, and ask you whether or not that refreshes your recollection.

Judge CORSON. That is true, there were many—these were being presented to the Meeting at every meeting.

Mr. ARENS. There was a series of these?

Judge CORSON. There was a series, with additional names, additional petitions.

Mr. ARENS. Were there any petitions presented to the Plymouth Monthly Meeting, any at all, to your knowledge, calling on the Monthly Meeting to confirm the appointment of Mary Knowles or to take a stand to retain Mary Knowles?

Judge CORSON. None whatever that I have ever heard of.

Mr. ARENS. Then is it true that all of the petitions which were presented to the Plymouth Monthly meeting to your knowledge were petitions opposing the retention of Mary Knowles?

Judge CORSON. That is true.

Mr. ARENS. How many members of the Plymouth Monthly Meeting, to your knowledge, expressed themselves in any mode as being in favor of the retention of Mary Knowles?

Judge CORSON. That is impossible to say because there have been different people expressing those thoughts at different meetings.

Mr. ARENS. What is the consensus of opinion among the members of the Plymouth Monthly Meeting as to the retention of Mary Knowles?

Judge CORSON. Well, in my belief the majority of the Meeting are very much against her retention and have been, and also very much against the acceptance of the award. However, if the Fund had given the award to the committee as such, the Meeting would not have any power whatever to refuse it. The Meeting could not have prevented its being accepted by the committee for the library.

Mr. ARENS. That is because the committee is autonomous isn't that correct?

Judge CORSON. Yes, as a contribution to the library, but the Meeting objects to being stigmatized by such an award.

Mr. ARENS. It is a fact, Judge—May I summarize the situation and correct me at any point where I may be wrong—it is a fact that the library committee, four members of which hired Mary Knowles, is not the recipient of the award from the Fund for the Republic?

Judge CORSON. That is true. They are not.

Mr. ARENS. It is a fact, is it not, Judge, that the Plymouth Monthly Meeting to which the Fund for the Republic directed its check for \$5,000 didn't hire Mary Knowles and didn't confirm the hiring of Mary Knowles?

Judge CORSON. And has no control over her. Absolutely they cannot force the committee to hire or fire. They can only recommend at the best.

Mr. ARENS. Is it your judgment that the direction of this check by the Fund for the Republic does stigmatize the good people in the Plymouth Monthly Meeting?

Judge CORSON. That is exactly the feeling.

Mr. ARENS. Is it further your opinion—I am just summarizing here and if I deviate one iota from the truth you stop me, is it further your opinion that the majority, overwhelming majority of the people in the Plymouth Monthly Meeting are opposed to the retention of Mary Knowles?

Judge CORSON. If we could get rid of the \$5,000 Fund for the Republic money, I think maybe we all would fall on each other's necks and say "Let's forget it all and let the woman stay." But it is the \$5,000 that holds everything up because everybody says, "What did you ever do to get a Communist \$5,000? Everybody is stigmatized. Are you all Communists?" Unfortunately, it is drawing people who come to the Meeting who are rather different from people who have been accustomed to coming.

Mr. ARENS. I lay before you now, if you please, sir, a document and ask you if you can identify that document.

Judge CORSON. I can.

Mr. ARENS. Describe that document for this record.

Judge CORSON. It is a letter that I wrote to the Committee of the Overseers and the Ministry and Council of Plymouth Meeting to be held on May 10.

Mr. ARENS. Judge, without our taking time at this instant to completely read all of the letter, you being a lawyer could give a fair summary I am sure of the essence of that letter. Would you kindly do so?

Mr. WEBSTER. May we have a copy?

Judge CORSON. I wanted to make my position so clear on communism that I wrote this letter so it could be made a part of the record as to how I stood at least. I said: "The really sad part, of course, in the whole matter is the fact that the employment of a former Communist has besmirched our Meeting as communistic and created such a division, not only in the neighborhood but among the members of the Meeting itself, that it may cause a more or less complete breakup of Plymouth Meeting. Is it worthwhile that the Meet-

ing should be ruined merely in a martyrdom crusade and complex of the library committee to support a so-called civil right that does not and never has existed?"

Mr. ARENS. Judge, are you conversant with the contents of a letter sent to the president of the Fund by Carroll Corson requesting the Fund please to withdraw its \$5,000 check?

Judge CORSON. Yes; I am. I think that is the letter where he said that it has been cashed—I think he meant deposited—by the member whose name has not been mentioned.

Mr. ARENS. When the meetings of the Monthly Meeting were resumed in September of 1955, did you attend and offer any proposal which in your judgment, was for the good of the Meeting?

Judge CORSON. I proposed at that time that perhaps we could get along with Mrs. Knowles if we were convinced that she was no longer a Communist, but I felt that we should adopt a minute and I would be satisfied to go along with Mrs. Knowles if we would adopt a minute that this Meeting takes the position that it is against communism and the Communist conspiracy.

Mr. ARENS. Excuse me, Judge.

Judge CORSON. There was laughter from the benches to the left, and I mean to the left. [Laughter.]

Mr. ARENS. What has been the effect in your judgment on the community, not the Plymouth Monthly Meeting, but the community, by this check for \$5,000 being sent by the Fund for the Republic to the Plymouth Monthly Meeting? What has been the effect on this community, Plymouth Meeting community?

Judge CORSON. I think the community would survive but the Meeting I doubt. I don't know what is going to happen to the Meeting. I haven't been to the Meeting for 7 months, the last 7 months. I have lost a period of happiness.

Mr. ARENS. Mr. Chairman, I respectfully suggest that this concludes the staff interrogation of this witness.

The CHAIRMAN. Judge Corson, are you acquainted with the minutes of Plymouth Meeting?

Judge CORSON. I was clerk for 2 years, several years ago.

The CHAIRMAN. Do they contain anything of a religious nature?

Judge CORSON. The only thing in the minutes that might refer to something of a religious nature is that after a period of silence the meeting concluded. Certainly the Friends worship is in silence, except when someone is moved to speak. So I suppose the reference to silence might be a reference to a method of worship, but I don't think there is any secret about it that it would harm the committee to know about.

The CHAIRMAN. Are you acquainted with the minutes maintained by the library committee?

Judge CORSON. I am not.

The CHAIRMAN. The preceding witness I think was on that committee, and I think he was the secretary of it, testified that there was nothing of a religious nature in those minutes.

Judge CORSON. I wouldn't know why there would be.

The CHAIRMAN. The only reason why I bring this up is because in advance of the testimony a person subpoenaed as a witness made the statement that we were violating some sort of privilege with

respect to religion, and I assure you that those of us on this committee who are lawyers know just exactly what the limits are and have never knowingly or otherwise violated any of the rights people have under the Constitution in that respect.

Call your next witness.

Mr. ARENS. Thank you, Judge.

Mrs. Emily Crawford, will you kindly come forward?

The CHAIRMAN. Do you affirm that the testimony you are about to give will be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

Mrs. CRAWFORD. I do so affirm.

TESTIMONY OF MRS. EMILY LIVEZEY CRAWFORD

Mr. ARENS. Please identify yourself by name, residence, and occupation.

Mrs. CRAWFORD. My name is Emily Livezey Crawford, 1415 Markley Street, Norristown, Pa. I am a housewife.

Mr. ARENS. Are you a birthright Quaker?

Mrs. CRAWFORD. I am.

Mr. ARENS. For how many generations has your family been a birthright Quaker?

Mrs. CRAWFORD. Four to my knowledge.

Mr. ARENS. How long have you been a member of the Plymouth Monthly Meeting?

Mrs. CRAWFORD. Sixty-two years last week.

Mr. ARENS. Have any of your forebears been members of the Plymouth Monthly Meeting?

Mrs. CRAWFORD. All of them.

Mr. ARENS. Are you a member of any other Quaker Meetings?

Mrs. CRAWFORD. No.

Mr. ARENS. How far do you live from the place of assembly of the Plymouth Meeting?

Mrs. CRAWFORD. Four miles. I live in Norristown.

But I do not drive.

Mr. ARENS. Do you have difficulty getting to the meetings?

Mrs. CRAWFORD. At the time my mother and I moved from Plymouth Meeting it was difficult, so she and I, living across from the Norristown Meeting, naturally attended that regularly as a matter of convenience.

Mr. ARENS. But you were not a member of the Norristown Meeting?

Mrs. CRAWFORD. Never.

Mr. ARENS. You have continuously been a member of the Plymouth Meeting?

Mrs. CRAWFORD. I have.

Mr. ARENS. In the course of the last few years have you been at least in occasional attendance at the Plymouth Monthly Meetings?

Mrs. CRAWFORD. Occasionally.

Mr. ARENS. Do you know a lady by the name of Edith Shoemaker?

Mrs. CRAWFORD. Very well.

Mr. ARENS. Kindly identify her, please.

Mrs. CRAWFORD. Edith Shoemaker is the most beloved Friend that I have ever heard of. She has been a minister in the Friends Meeting,

at Plymouth Meeting, for years. Every one loves her and respects her.

Mr. ARENS. Has she been in conversation with you respecting her efforts to restore peace and unity within the Plymouth Monthly Meeting religious groups?

Mrs. CRAWFORD. Yes, on many occasions.

Mr. ARENS. Did she enlist your services and good offices to further this noble objective?

Mrs. CRAWFORD. I offered my services.

Mr. ARENS. Then did you attend the meetings more regularly of the Plymouth Meeting even at your own inconvenience?

Mrs. CRAWFORD. I did.

Mr. ARENS. Were you present when Mrs. Lillian Tapley, chairman of the library committee, read her yearly report at the Plymouth Monthly Meeting?

Mrs. CRAWFORD. I was there when she read her yearly report in May 1955 and again May 1956. I don't know which you are alluding to.

Mr. ARENS. Did she in either of those reports, particularly the one in May 1956, make any reference to Mary Knowles in the Plymouth Monthly Meeting?

Mrs. CRAWFORD. No, her report was a very glowing one, that the library circulation had increased, the membership had increased amazingly. I got to my feet and remarked "Well, couldn't some of that be due to the increase in the population, because new communities are going up all around our beloved Meeting?"

Mr. ARENS. Was any reference made at any time in the Plymouth Monthly Meeting by Mrs. Tapley to an investigation conducted by the library committee of Mary Knowles?

Mrs. CRAWFORD. Yes.

Mr. ARENS. What did she say?

Mrs. CRAWFORD. After her report at the May meeting, 1955, she had several papers there and she said that the library committee had investigated Mary Knowles before they hired her as a permanent librarian, that Mary Knowles told them at an interview that she had been called to Washington and questioned.

Mr. ARENS. Did she at any time recite to the Plymouth Monthly Meeting that of the 8 members of the library committee only 4 were in favor of the employment of Mary Knowles?

Mrs. CRAWFORD. Never in my hearing.

Mr. ARENS. How did you receive knowledge of the award or the check which was being directed to the Plymouth Monthly Meeting by the Fund for the Republic?

Mrs. CRAWFORD. By the press. My husband brought me home a Philadelphia paper, and it was in large headlines. That was my first knowledge.

Mr. ARENS. Did you take any action relative to the acceptance of the award by the Plymouth Monthly Meeting?

Mrs. CRAWFORD. Not until July 2.

Mr. ARENS. What happened then?

Mrs. CRAWFORD. I called John Archibald, our then clerk of the Monthly Meeting, on the phone at his home Saturday, July 2, 1955. I asked him about the presentation of this \$5,000 award, and I said, "John, this cannot be accepted. It has not been brought up before our Monthly Meeting."

He questioned it. I said, "But, John, our Monthly Meeting has to act on this award before it can be accepted. Having no Monthly Meeting in the month of July or August regularly, he then consented to say that it would be acted upon at our September Monthly Meeting, 1955.

Mr. ARENS. Was it ever acted on by the Plymouth Monthly Meeting from the standpoint of accepting the award?

Mrs. CRAWFORD. It came up at our Monthly Meeting in September, just as he promised.

Mr. ARENS. Was it accepted?

Mrs. CRAWFORD. No.

Mr. ARENS. What happened?

Mrs. CRAWFORD. There was a great controversy over it, pro and con. Our respected Judge Corson got up and said—and I agree with what he just told us—that he did not approve. A great many of our Meeting felt the same way about it. They felt it should be sent back. Carroll Corson, who wrote that letter, got to his feet and said the trustees have just had a meeting and they had agreed to send it back. But there was just a turmoil in the Meeting.

Mr. ARENS. Did you ever request an opportunity to inspect the minutes of the Plymouth Monthly Meeting?

Mrs. CRAWFORD. I did.

Mr. ARENS. Were you accorded that privilege?

Mrs. CRAWFORD. I was. At that time it was the privilege of any member of a Friends Meeting at any time to consult the records of any meeting.

Mr. ARENS. What did you find in the minutes with reference to the resignation of Isaac Sheppard?

Mrs. CRAWFORD. Only in the October minutes of 1954 it was briefly announced that Isaac Sheppard had resigned as treasurer and member of the William Jeanes Library Committee, and it had been accepted with regret.

Mr. ARENS. Was there any statement in there as to the reason?

Mrs. CRAWFORD. No.

Mr. ARENS. Did you find recorded any place in the minutes Judge Corson's presentation of a petition requesting the removal of Mary Knowles?

Mrs. CRAWFORD. That he handed to the Monthly Meeting?

Mr. ARENS. Yes.

Mrs. CRAWFORD. No.

Mr. ARENS. Did you see any reference in those minutes to petitions presented by Martha Sherron?

Mrs. CRAWFORD. No.

Mr. ARENS. Was Mrs. Shoemaker's plea in April of 1955 for the restoration of unanimity in the Meeting by replacing Mary Knowles recorded in the minutes?

Mrs. CRAWFORD. It was very briefly mentioned.

Mr. ARENS. Did you see in the minutes any record of Mrs. Shoemaker's presentation of petitions requesting that Mary Knowles be replaced?

Mrs. CRAWFORD. No.

That should have been in the September minutes, 1955.

Mr. ARENS. Did you see in the minutes any reference to Judge Corson's proposal that the Meeting go on record as opposed to Communists?

Mrs. CRAWFORD. No, only—may I tell this or am I taking too much time?

Mr. ARENS. You go right ahead please.

Mrs. CRAWFORD. That came up at the September Monthly Meeting, as he has just told you. Feeling that there was a possibility that that would be omitted from the minutes like lots of other things that came up in our meeting, I particularly listened to the reading of our September minutes at the October meeting. There was no mention of that. So I got to my feet when they asked if there should be any corrections to the minutes.

Mr. ARENS. Who makes the minutes? Who keeps the minutes of the Meeting?

Mrs. CRAWFORD. The clerk.

Mr. ARENS. Who is he or she?

Mrs. CRAWFORD. In 1955 it was John Archibald. At present it is Dr. Louise Gloeckner.

Mr. ARENS. What has been the attitude of each of those two with respect to the retention of Mary Knowles?

Mrs. CRAWFORD. John Archibald was a member of the library committee up until the first of this year.

Mr. ARENS. What was his position on Mary Knowles?

Mrs. CRAWFORD. Definitely for her.

Mr. SCHIERER. What was his position on accepting the award from the Fund for the Republic?

Mrs. CRAWFORD. I think it was their plan to accept it if it hadn't been called to their attention that it could not be accepted without first coming before our Monthly Meeting.

Mr. ARENS. Did you find recorded in these minutes any mention at all of the protests to the hiring of Mary Knowles, the petitions demanding that she be removed or replaced?

Mrs. CRAWFORD. I did not consult the minutes of every month from 1953, but, Mr. Arens, the minutes that I just hurriedly glanced through had no mention of Mary Knowles in it.

Mr. ARENS. Since the tender of this \$5,000 check to the Plymouth Monthly Meeting by the Fund for the Republic for the hiring, which it did not do, of Mary Knowles, can you tell us, have any of the members of the Plymouth Monthly Meeting resigned?

Mrs. CRAWFORD. Definitely.

Mr. ARENS. About how many, to your certain knowledge, have resigned after this check from the Fund for the Republic was sent to the Plymouth Monthly Meeting for hiring Mary Knowles, which it did not do?

Mrs. CRAWFORD. One family of five; another family whose resignation yet has not been read—it has been presented—of four. Then there have been 5 individuals.

Mr. ARENS. Incidentally, do you have knowledge as to how many people have resigned from the library committee, of the eight, or do you know?

Mrs. CRAWFORD. Oh, yes. Isaac Sheppard, who is a member of the Meeting. Helen Browning resigned. Henry Hemsley and Lewis Sheppard, who represented the township.

Mr. ARENS. Then half of the library committee have resigned; is that correct?

Mrs. CRAWFORD. Yes, but John Archibald, somewhere along the line before I attended the Monthly Meetings regularly, became a member.

Mr. ARENS. Then do you think it is quite fair and honest to characterize the opposition to Mary Knowles in this community as a small, determined group or would you say that the opposition to the retention of Mary Knowles was not from a small, determined group?

Mrs. CRAWFORD. You mean from the Meeting or the community?

Mr. ARENS. From the community.

Mrs. CRAWFORD. Well, of course I am living in Norristown. I am not conversant with the community. But I do know that up to date Mrs. Corson has had over 884 signed petitions.

Mr. ARENS. In the community?

Mrs. CRAWFORD. And our Meeting is included. The members of our Meeting are included.

Mr. ARENS. How many petitions have been signed urging the retention of Mary Knowles?

Mrs. CRAWFORD. I personally have received four from the members of our Monthly Meeting.

Mr. ARENS. Four who want to retain Mary Knowles and eight-hundred-and-some-odd who do not want to retain her, is that correct?

Mrs. CRAWFORD. Well, I can only speak for those who actually sent me letters or signed a slip that they wanted her retained, and there were four.

Mr. ARENS. Mr. Chairman, I respectfully suggest that will conclude the staff interrogation of this witness.

The CHAIRMAN. You are excused, Mrs. Crawford, with the thanks of the committee.

Call your next witness.

Mr. ARENS. Mrs. Lillian Tapley, would you kindly come forward?

The CHAIRMAN. Do you swear or affirm the testimony you are about to give will be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

Mrs. TAPLEY. I do so affirm.

The CHAIRMAN. Proceed.

TESTIMONY OF MRS. LILLIAN TAPLEY, ACCOMPANIED BY COUNSEL, HARRY E. SPROGELL

Mr. ARENS. Will you kindly identify yourself, if you please, by name, residence, and occupation?

Mrs. TAPLEY. I am Lillian Tapley, Mrs. Paul Tapley, 134 Plymouth Road, Plymouth Meeting, combination of housewife and business-woman.

Mr. ARENS. Mrs. Tapley, are you or have you been connected with the William Jeanes Memorial Library of Plymouth Meeting?

Mrs. TAPLEY. I have.

Mr. ARENS. I beg your pardon, counsel. I apologize; I should have recognized you.

You are represented today by counsel?

Mrs. TAPLEY. Yes.

Mr. ARENS. Counsel, will you kindly identify yourself?

Mr. SPROGELL. Harry E. Sprogell. May I address the Chair, Mr. Walter?

The CHAIRMAN. No. You may advise your client.

Mrs. TAPLEY. May I ask something? May I make a statement before we go on?

The CHAIRMAN. Just answer the questions, please. If you have any statement, under the rules of this committee you may submit it to the committee and we will examine it and if we find it germane we will make it a part of the record.

Mr. SPROGELL. That was done, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. ARENS. Will you kindly tell us what connection you have had with the William Jeanes Memorial Library at Plymouth Meeting?

Mrs. TAPLEY. Mr. Walter, this statement was made and delivered to the chairman—you are chairman, I believe—of the committee yesterday, and, therefore, I ask that I may read it.

The CHAIRMAN. Was it delivered to me or to the Philadelphia newspapers?

Mrs. TAPLEY. I believe to Mr. Leo Lilly, Clerk of the Court, for delivery to you.

Mr. ARENS. Mr. Chairman, in fairness I should say that there has been directed to my attention in the course of the last 24 hours, perhaps the last 48 hours, a statement which was submitted by Mrs. Tapley, but in view of the press of these hearings I haven't had a chance to read the statement. I understand it is right here.

The CHAIRMAN. It may be made a part of the record.

Mr. ARENS. Here is the statement, Mr. Chairman. It is a mimeographed statement of considerable length.

Mrs. TAPLEY. There are also documents which accompany it, and I wish that they also may be made part of the record.

Mr. ARENS. They will be submitted for the record, as the chairman has said.

Perhaps, Mrs. Tapley, we can start at the beginning of where we left off. What is and what has been your connection with the William Jeanes Memorial Library?

Mrs. TAPLEY. Could I interrupt again? I want to make it clear, has the chairman granted my request that this be made a part of the record, the statement and the documents?¹

Mr. ARENS. That is a matter for determination of the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. I did, and so did Mr. Arens.

Mrs. TAPLEY. Thank you very much.

Mr. ARENS. Now let's start all over again, if you please, so this record is clear. Perhaps you have answered the question, but let us have it again so we have the proper sequence here. What is and has been your connection with the William Jeanes Memorial Library at Plymouth Meeting?

Mrs. TAPLEY. I was appointed to the library committee sometime in the early forties, I think 1941. I was made chairman of the committee in 1952, I believe.

Mr. ARENS. Have you served continuously since then as chairman of the committee?

Mrs. TAPLEY. Since then, yes.

¹ The statement and documents submitted by Mrs. Tapley, as "Tapley Exhibit No. 1," appear on pp. 5524-5536.

Mr. ARENS. Are you chairman of the committee at the present time?

Mrs. TAPLEY. I am.

Mr. ARENS. Are you also a member of the Plymouth Monthly Meeting?

Mrs. TAPLEY. I am.

Mr. ARENS. Are you also one of the trustees appointed by the Plymouth Monthly Meeting, in addition to being the chairman of the library committee?

Mrs. TAPLEY. I am.

Mr. ARENS. As trustee, what are your functions, in addition to your service as chairman of the library committee?

Mrs. TAPLEY. My present function is to be a part signer of checks and to oversee or help oversee what takes place in our Meeting and to keep an eye alert for things that go on in our library, just as the rest of the committee do. We are all on an equal basis, except for the signing of checks.

Mr. ARENS. There are two trustees; are there not?

Mrs. TAPLEY. At the present. That is not indicated in the will.

Mr. ARENS. Who is the other trustee, please?

Mrs. TAPLEY. Ray Riday.

Mr. ARENS. How long have you been a trustee, in addition to being chairman of the library committee?

Mrs. TAPLEY. I think about 1952 also.

Mr. ARENS. Are you conversant with the fact that Isaac Sheppard resigned from the library committee in September of 1954?

Mrs. TAPLEY. I am.

Mr. ARENS. Is it true that Mr. Sheppard was treasurer of the committee for approximately thirty-some years?

Mrs. TAPLEY. Yes; he was.

Mr. ARENS. How many people resigned from the library committee in 1954?

Mrs. TAPLEY. Well, that is a matter that I might say this way: That we had a committee.

Mr. ARENS. Of how many members?

Mrs. TAPLEY. Which ostensibly included Mrs. Browning and also Isaac Sheppard and his brother, Lew, and Henry Hemsley, but Isaac and Henry were never appointed by the Meeting. They existed purely in an honorary capacity which Isaac Sheppard assured us they would do when we accepted the money from the commissioners.

Mr. ARENS. How many members were there on the library committee?

Mrs. TAPLEY. I beg your pardon. Did I say Isaac? I meant Lewis Sheppard was an honorary member.

Mr. ARENS. How many members were there on the library committee in 1954?

Mrs. TAPLEY. I think there were eight.

Mr. ARENS. How many resigned from the library committee in 1954?

Mrs. TAPLEY. If we assumed that Lew and Henry were only honorary members, just the one resigned and that is Mrs. Browning.

Mr. ARENS. Did Henry Hemsley resign from the library committee even though it was from an honorary status?

Mrs. TAPLEY. He didn't come to meetings any more.

Mr. ARENS. Did Lewis Sheppard disassociate himself from the library committee in 1954?

Mrs. TAPLEY. He did not come to meetings any more.

Mr. ARENS. Did Mrs. Browning disassociate herself from the library committee?

Mrs. TAPLEY. Not on that account, I believe. She told me when I called her—I used to call the members of the committee when meetings were arranged and necessary, either regular or special to advise them, and she told me that her husband was in a business that she really couldn't leave home at night—

Mr. ARENS. Did she then disassociate herself?

Mrs. TAPLEY. Yes. She was not able to come very much and she finally didn't come at all.

Mr. ARENS. And Mr. Isaac Sheppard disassociated himself?

Mrs. TAPLEY. He definitely resigned.

Mr. ARENS. Which means that of the 8 members on the board, 4 in 1954 disassociated themselves for some reason or other; is that correct?

Mrs. TAPLEY. That is correct.

Mr. ARENS. Of those four persons who disassociated themselves in 1954, how many were opposed to the engagement on a permanent basis of Mary Knowles?

Mrs. TAPLEY. Definitely Isaac Sheppard and Henry Hemsley and Lew Sheppard. Mrs. Browning never expressed herself in too lengthly a manner. She is a nice, quiet, unassuming person.

Mr. ARENS. These four people who disassociated themselves from the board were replaced with others; is that correct?

Mrs. TAPLEY. No; our board exists now with the remaining members of the committee.

Mr. ARENS. Then there are now four members of the board?

Mrs. TAPLEY. There are five, I believe.

Mr. ARENS. Then someone must have been added because there were only 8 and 4 disassociated themselves.

Mrs. TAPLEY. Yes; one was added.

Mr. ARENS. Who was that?

Mrs. TAPLEY. That was Mrs. Charles Chapple, Mrs. Mary Chapple.

Mr. ARENS. Did you in the course of your chairmanship of the library committee undertake to conduct an investigation with respect to one Mary Knowles?

Mrs. TAPLEY. Yes; we did.

Mr. ARENS. Just tell us now what you did toward conducting that investigation.

Mrs. TAPLEY. We knew of the background of Mary Knowles from what she had told us.

Mr. ARENS. I beg your pardon? I didn't hear that.

Mrs. TAPLEY. We knew in a sense of her background. She told us that she had appeared before a congressional committee and that she could not from that time on answer questions about that particular thing since she had refused to answer a congressional committee. We asked her if she was a Communist and she said no, she definitely was not.

Since we are in the Friends Society we don't use oaths. The truth is sufficient.

Mr. ARENS. I understand.

Mrs. TAPLEY. Then she gave us the names of her former employers, or an employer I should say, in the Norwood Library to whom we wrote. She wrote us a letter—I don't want to use the word "fulsome" but it was a very fine letter regarding everything that Mary Knowles had ever done in her 5 years' experience.

Mr. ARENS. When you say "we," was this investigation you are talking about participated in by all of the library committee or by a subcommittee of the library committee?

Mrs. TAPLEY. It was participated in by four of the members, the others not being too interested.

Mr. ARENS. Of the four members of the library committee who conducted this investigation, how many were of the persuasion that Mary Knowles should be engaged permanently?

Mrs. TAPLEY. Could I change that a bit. It might have been five members. I think Mrs. Chapple was on the board then when we were personally investigating Mrs. Knowles. I am a little vague on that. At any rate, will you repeat that question? I didn't quite get it.

Mr. ARENS. In view of the fact that there was a change in your answer there, I will disregard the question for a moment. Did you solicit information from the United States Senate Internal Security Subcommittee?

Mrs. TAPLEY. We heard about that and we did have copies of it; yes; very definitely.

Mr. ARENS. Did you write to the United States Senate Internal Security Subcommittee, as you wrote to her former employers and solicit from them information respecting Mary Knowles?

Mrs. TAPLEY. One of our committee interviewed a member of the FBI, talked with him, and we were——

Mr. ARENS. You didn't answer my question. Did you solicit information from the United States Senate Internal Security Subcommittee before which Mary Knowles was interrogated?

Mrs. TAPLEY. No; we had the newspaper reports.

Mr. ARENS. Did it not cross your mind that that might be a good source of information since you solicited information from the numerous employers or the people who knew about her past employment?

(The witness conferred with her counsel.)

Mr. ARENS. Mr. Chairman, could we have order, please?

The CHAIRMAN. The committee will be in order.

Before you proceed, when you interrogated this lady for prospective employment, did you ask her about her employment at the Samuel Adams School in Boston?

Mrs. TAPLEY. Yes; we did.

The CHAIRMAN. What was her reply about that?

Mrs. TAPLEY. Her reply was that as she had been interrogated by a congressional committee and used the fifth amendment her counsel had told her she could not answer anything about her life prior to that time.

The CHAIRMAN. You were inquiring into her qualifications? She told you that she was employed by the Samuel Adams School?

Mrs. TAPLEY. Yes; that is correct.

The CHAIRMAN. Didn't you know that the Samuel Adams School was an adjunct of the Communist Party in Boston?

Mrs. TAPLEY. Only that she told me that.

The CHAIRMAN. It is a matter of public record.

Mrs. TAPLEY. I am sorry.

The CHAIRMAN. And she told you that?

Mrs. TAPLEY. She told me that, that it was put on the subversive list.

The CHAIRMAN. She told you that she was employed by this adjunct of the Communist Party?

Mrs. TAPLEY. That is right. No; she said nothing about the Communist Party. She said she was secretary for the Samuel Adams School.

Mr. ARENS. At the time of your interrogation or at any time did you ascertain that the Samuel Adams School was an adjunct of the Communist conspiracy?

Mrs. TAPLEY. I read it in the newspaper.

Mr. ARENS. Did you know it as of the time you interrogated her?

Mrs. TAPLEY. No; I did not.

Mr. ARENS. When did you read it in the newspaper or acquire the knowledge.

Mrs. TAPLEY. I can't tell you that.

Mr. ARENS. Was that subsequent to the engagement of Mary Knowles or prior to the engagement?

Mrs. TAPLEY. It was prior to her permanent engagement, subsequent to her temporary engagement.

Mr. ARENS. Did you interrogate her as to whether or not when she was before the Senate committee she declined to tell the Senate committee about other persons known by her to have been members of the Communist conspiracy?

Mrs. TAPLEY. We read the testimony.

Mr. ARENS. Did you interrogate her about that?

Mrs. TAPLEY. No; I did not.

Mr. ARENS. Was this interrogation which you conducted of Mary Knowles in the presence of the entire membership of the library committee?

Mrs. TAPLEY. The first was just she and I alone when she divulged to me, without being asked, that she thought possibly we might not be interested in her employment on account of this background.

Mr. ARENS. How did you first know of Mary Knowles? How did you first make contact with her?

Mrs. TAPLEY. Our librarian, Mrs. Sawyer, had this accident and, as has been said before, we got along until October with various substitutes, and in October we just discovered or found that the substitutes were not able to continue. They had children. They had jobs. They had this and that. They just could not continue. So we had to look around for someone to take the job. I called various schools. I called Drexel Library School and I called the University of Pennsylvania Library; I called the Freeley Library and I believe the Mercantile Library—everybody that I could think of that would help me. I could get no one there that we were able to engage. One of them told me that I might call this Mr. Beatty at the library of the College of Physicians, and I did. He told me that he had a couple of people in his files who might do. He gave me two names I think and I called and they were both completely impossible. I mean they were older and couldn't come over for some reason. So I called him again. I said, "Have you any idea who I can get?"

He said, "Well, I have another woman in my files and she sounded very good to me. Her ability seems to be just about the best. Why don't you go and see her?"

That is how I found Mary Knowles.

Mr. ARENS. Did you correspond with her and invite her to come to see you or did you call?

Mrs. TAPLEY. No; I telephoned her and made an appointment and went over to see her and within 5 minutes of my arrival she told me of her background, that much of her background.

Mr. ARENS. Did she tell you that she had been a member of the Communist conspiracy?

Mrs. TAPLEY. She did not.

Mr. ARENS. When was the next interview that you or any one to your knowledge connected with the library committee had with Mary Knowles?

Mrs. TAPLEY. I went to our library committee and told them that we had contacted or I had contacted a possible librarian but there was a doubt because she had told me she had used the fifth amendment, and what did they think. They said, "Well, we might interview her." I had her come over and they interviewed her and they decided to employ her.

Mr. ARENS. Inviting your attention to the proposition of the permanent employment of Mary Knowles, that is, before she was permanently employed, did you request information from the United States Senate Internal Security Subcommittee before which she was interrogated with respect to her background and activities?

Mrs. TAPLEY. No; we did not. We read the reports.

Mr. ARENS. Who read the reports?

Mrs. TAPLEY. I think most of the committee read them.

Mr. ARENS. Was she interrogated by the committee members prior to the time that she was engaged permanently?

Mrs. TAPLEY. No more than we had already done. We had absolutely fine references about her from everyone who had employed her outside of the Samuel Adams School whom, of course, we didn't contact.

Mr. SCHERER. You say you had fine references from everyone?

Mrs. TAPLEY. When I say everyone, the references that came from the Norwood School included references from the schools where she had worked before for many years.

Mr. SCHERER. You received replies as a result of the inquiries you had sent out?

Mrs. TAPLEY. Written inquiries that we sent out to these specific people.

Mr. SCHERER. Did you send out those inquiries about the time you read the report of the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee?

Mrs. TAPLEY. This was in October of 1953. No, wait a minute. Yes, October 1953.

Mr. SCHERER. You did not write or contact the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee?

Mrs. TAPLEY. We did not.

Mr. SCHERER. To ask for whatever information they might have?

Mrs. TAPLEY. No.

Mr. ARENS. Did you have the information that she had been discharged from the Norwood Library?

Mrs. TAPLEY. We did. She told us.

Mr. ARENS. Does the rule of unanimity or the policy of unanimity prevail in the library committee as it does, so we have been told, in the Plymouth Monthly Meeting?

Mrs. TAPLEY. Not to the extent it does in the Monthly Meeting. Certainly we always agree on policies.

Mr. ARENS. Did you cause to be sent to each member of the library committee a notification of the meeting in which Mary Knowles was to be engaged permanently?

Mrs. TAPLEY. I believe so. That is hard for me to remember. I used to do the calling myself in those days, until, of course, when Mary Knowles took over permanently; she sends out all notices. But I think up to that time I did the telephoning.

Mr. ARENS. Did you call the two Sheppards?

Mrs. TAPLEY. I called Mr. Isaac Sheppard, but Mr. Isaac Sheppard had told me in the beginning that I was not ever to bother to call Lewis Sheppard because he would always see that he was advised. I called Henry Hemsley continually at his place of business. He has a gasoline operator place and I called and left messages for him always when we were having a meeting. I did it mostly by telephone because I was very busy and it was easier to do it that way.

Mr. SCHERER. Mr. Chairman, may I ask a question?

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Scherer.

Mr. SCHERER. Mrs. Tapley, when did you first learn that the Fund for the Republic was going to make an award as a result of the library board meeting retaining Mary Knowles?

Mrs. TAPLEY. It was either April or May.

Mr. SCHERER. Of what year?

Mrs. TAPLEY. Of last year.

Mr. SCHERER. How did you learn about that?

Mrs. TAPLEY. My fellow committee member, Mrs. Chapple, called me and said that she had heard that we were possibly to be sent this award if we were considered properly.

Mr. SCHERER. Was that before any public announcement?

Mrs. TAPLEY. Oh, heavens, yes.

Mr. SCHERER. How long before any public announcement?

Mrs. TAPLEY. This was either April or May. Then after that, I think in May, early May, she called me again and said that she had had word that Miss Maureen Black was coming to make an investigation and could I be present to help answer the questions.

Mr. SCHERER. So you had knowledge of a possible award before Miss Black came?

Mrs. TAPLEY. No. Well, just the very few words that I had introduced the subject.

Mr. SCHERER. Do you know with whom Mrs. Chapple had her contact in the Fund for the Republic?

Mrs. TAPLEY. I don't know. I think it was Mr. Sprogell who told Mrs. Chapple. That is all I can tell you. I knew nothing about it. To me it just sounded like a very lovely fairytale.

Mr. SCHERER. Mr. who told Mrs. Chapple?

Mrs. TAPLEY. Mr. Sprogell.

Mr. SPROGELL. I.

Mr. SCHERER. Who is Mr. Sprogell? Is he connected with your church?

Mrs. TAPLEY. He is a member of the Society of Friends; yes.

Mr. SCHERER. Do you know who contacted him originally?

Mrs. TAPLEY. We heard afterward, but not until after the award was made. We were always curious.

(The witness conferred with her counsel.)

Mrs. TAPLEY. Then it is only a matter of gossip and not a matter of my knowledge, so I don't think I should say it.

Mr. SCHERER. Did Mr. Sprogell tell you who contacted him?

Mrs. TAPLEY. No; he did not. I just asked him should I tell who I heard in a gossipy way, but I don't think I should repeat what I don't know to be actually the case.

Mr. SCHERER. That is the thing this committee would like to know. At least this member of the committee would like to know more than anything else. How was this contact made by the Fund? What was the purpose behind it?

Mr. SPROGELL. I will be happy to testify, Congressman.

Mrs. SCHERER. I am asking the witness.

Mrs. TAPLEY. I heard, but I don't know officially. It is like so many other things you hate to repeat, I hate to repeat gossip, something that doesn't come to me as I believe it should.

Mr. SCHERER. How many weeks was it before the investigator for the Fund appeared in the community that you heard this rumor that an award would be made?

Mrs. TAPLEY. It was possibly 2 weeks, maybe not even that long. It is a little hard to tell, you know, when you are trying to think back.

Mr. SCHERER. With how many representatives of the Fund did you personally have conversations?

Mr. TAPLEY. At any time?

Mr. SCHERER. Yes.

Mrs. TAPLEY. Well, on the first occasion just with Miss Black to whom we gave all our records, both pro and con, both anti and for. She had everything. We concealed nothing about the horrible attacks which were being made on us.

Mr. SCHERER. You mean by other members of the congregation?

Mrs. TAPLEY. And the DAR and the Veterans of Foreign Wars. She had all the information.

Mr. SCHERER. Did you give her excerpts from the minutes of your meetings?

Mrs. TAPLEY. That I am not at all sure of. We only gave her information, as I remember. We might have given her——

Mr. SCHERER. Were you here this morning when she testified?

Mrs. TAPLEY. Yes; I was.

Mr. SCHERER. She testified she was given excerpts from the minutes dealing with this subject.

Mrs. TAPLEY. That is correct. So we must perhaps have copied our decision and given that to her.

Mr. SCHERER. Did you talk to the investigator on that particular day that she came to the community for the purpose of making that investigation?

Mrs. TAPLEY. That is correct.

Mr. SCHERER. How long did you talk with her?

Mrs. TAPLEY. For a matter of possibly 3 hours.

Mr. SCHERER. Have you ever seen her since?

Mrs. TAPLEY. Yes; I saw her when the award was made.

Mr. SCHERER. That was a formal presentation of the award?

Mrs. TAPLEY. That is correct. Yes.

Mr. SCHERER. Did you discuss with anyone else from the Fund for the Republic the giving of this award and the reasons for it?

Mrs. TAPLEY. No; I did not. As I say, until the award was made to me it was just a fairytale in the sky.

Mr. SCHERER. It is a fairytale to this committee, too.

Mrs. TAPLEY. I know, but it is a wonderful fairytale, and I must tell you that at that time I did not know who the Fund for the Republic were, so you can see how very stupid I was.

Mr. SCHERER. The only conversation which you have ever had, as I understand it, directly with any representative of the Fund for the Republic, is your 3-hour conversation with the investigator when she came to your community, and then you happened to see her again when the award was made?

Mrs. TAPLEY. No; I saw her on two other occasions. I saw her the night before the award was made when she came over to make it.

Mr. SCHERER. That was after the award was already decided upon?

Mrs. TAPLEY. And I met——

Mr. SCHERER. Did you have any conversation with her at that time as to why the Fund for the Republic was doing this?

Mrs. TAPLEY. No.

The CHAIRMAN. Were you subpoenaed to bring the minutes of the library committee?

Mrs. TAPLEY. I was.

The CHAIRMAN. Did you announce to the press on yesterday that you were not going to comply with the subpoena because——

Mrs. TAPLEY. My statement from my counsel so announced, because we had a special meeting of our Plymouth Friends Meeting, and they did not feel it would be a proper thing to do, that it was rather a violation of the first amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. In view of the fact that there is nothing of a religious nature in these minutes, I am surprised, to say the least.

Mrs. TAPLEY. You say, Mr. Walter——

The CHAIRMAN. I am only repeating it because of what the members of the committee have testified to.

Mrs. TAPLEY. They completely overlook, I think, the fact of the spiritual values of our minutes.

Mr. SCHERER. You had no hesitancy, however, in giving to an investigator of the Fund for the Republic, about which you knew very little, excerpts from those minutes, though, did you?

Mrs. TAPLEY. Well, that was a request for information.

The CHAIRMAN. That is what this subpoena was.

Mrs. TAPLEY. That is a completely different thing, a command and a request.

The CHAIRMAN. I will tell you how it is different. This happens to be a committee of the Congress of the United States——

Mrs. TAPLEY. I understand that.

The Chairman (continuing). Charged with doing a very unpleasant task.

Mrs. TAPLEY. I can see that.

The CHAIRMAN. That is a very mild statement, I assure you. The other people who looked at the records have no responsibilities at all. You had no obligation whatsoever but you were perfectly willing to show them the record, but when a committee of the Congress of this Republic asks you, then you invoke a section of the Constitution of the United States.

Mrs. TAPLEY. You are wrong, Mr. Walter. I did not refuse. The Meeting refused. I am merely their servant.

The CHAIRMAN. I thought the Meeting has nothing to do with the library committee.

Mrs. TAPLEY. Yes; it has. Every committee functions under the care of the Meeting—the school committee, the property committee, the library committee.

The CHAIRMAN. I do not want to argue with you. I will accept what you say.

Mrs. TAPLEY. Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Arens, is there anything further?

Mr. SCHERER. May I ask one further question?

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Scherer.

Mr. SCHERER. Is your counsel a member of the community and of the church?

Mrs. TAPLEY. He is a member of the Friends Meeting but not our Friends Meeting or our locality.

Mr. SCHERER. He was the one who brought to you originally the information?

Mrs. TAPLEY. Not to me.

Mr. SCHERER. Well, to your group.

Mrs. TAPLEY. Yes.

Mr. SCHERER. The fact that the Fund for the Republic had interested themselves in this project?

Mrs. TAPLEY. I think so.

Mr. SCHERER. That is all.

The CHAIRMAN. That will be all.

The committee wishes to thank the judge who so generously permitted us to use the courtroom and the court officials who have cooperated, as well as the press, for the very good coverage of this hearing.

The hearing is adjourned.

(Whereupon, at 4:35 p. m., Wednesday, July 18, 1956, the committee was recessed subject to the call of the Chair.)

TAPLEY EXHIBIT No. 1

STATEMENT OF MRS. LILLIAN P. TAPLEY

(Filed with Un-American Activities Committee, 9 a. m., July 17, 1956)

An inquiry into why the Fund For The Republic should have made an award to Plymouth Monthly Meeting of the Religious Society of Friends necessarily raises the question why the Meeting should have employed Mrs. Mary Knowles in a library under its care. The award was made for that action.

All the actions of Plymouth Monthly Meeting and of the Library Committee which conducts a part of the Meeting's affairs have been intended to express Christian beliefs of the Religious Society of Friends. A question concerning those actions is an inquiry into those beliefs and their practice.

The considerations which inspired the Meeting's conduct have been stated in materials made public by the Library Committee in the past: A letter to the Commissioners of Plymouth Township dated September 22, 1954; a report of

the Library Committee prepared in October, 1954; and a letter to the Ambler Gazette dated March 7, 1955.

The position of the Religious Society of Friends is evidenced by advices prepared by a called meeting of Friends at Scattergood School in Iowa on the 2d to 4th of 4th Month 1954; a statement concerning civil liberties adopted by the Abington Quarterly Meeting of Friends held 5th Month 7th, 1953; a statement on civil liberties issued by the Representative Meeting of Philadelphia Yearly Meeting of the Religious Society of Friends on 4th Month 20th, 1956; and a statement on civil liberties adopted by the Philadelphia Yearly Meetings on March 27, 1954.

I ask that a copy of each of these documents be made a part of the transcript and printed in the record of these hearings.

Mrs. LILLIAN P. TAPLEY.

[From Norristown Times Herald, September 24, 1954]

OPEN LETTER ON LIBRARY FUND SENT PLYMOUTH COMMISSIONERS

In response to the action of the Plymouth Township Commissioners to defer a \$500 appropriation for the William Jeanes Memorial Library, Plymouth Meeting, the following letter was received by the Times Herald:

SEPTEMBER 22, 1954.

Open Letter to the Commissioners of Plymouth Township:

We, of the Library Committee of the Jeanes Memorial Library, feel that an explanation of our responsibilities and policies would be helpful to you in arriving at a decision as to whether or not you will continue your appropriation.

In the original bequest for the library, it is stated that the library shall be operated as a free or public library under the care of trustees appointed by Plymouth Monthly Meeting of the Religious Society of Friends (Quakers), on the grounds of the Meeting or on land purchased for the purpose by the Meeting. It has been so operated since 1933, for 2 years in a rented building and since then in a building constructed for the purpose on the grounds of the Friends Meeting. The Committee consists of the appointed trustees and three other members of the Religious Society of Friends. On this appointed Committee rests the administration of the library, the employment of those who work there, the purchase of books, the raising and guardianship of funds, the services to the schools, etc. In recent years the income from invested funds has been inadequate to meet the increased costs. You, the Whitemarsh Supervisors, and the Conshohocken Community Chest, have been a very great help to us in continuing this public service. Certainly, as the appropriators of public funds, you are entitled to know our policies and to receive a copy of our budget and report.

Your question as to the employment of Mrs. Mary Knowles as stated in the Norristown Times Herald, Tuesday, September 14, is a matter of policy and we welcome this opportunity to make known our position in this matter.

First, we should like to point out that we share with you a strong conviction that no subversive person should be employed in any role of service to the public, and that we have made every effort to arrive at the facts—so that our policies might be based on reality rather than prejudice and fancy.

You may have heard that Mrs. Knowles invoked the Fifth Amendment when called to Washington by the Senate Judiciary Committee. She was called in connection with the investigation of an adult school in Boston. Mrs. Knowles informed the full Jeanes Library Committee of the investigation and her role in it when she was first interviewed as a substitute by us in October 1953. At that time she was accepted as a substitute and served ably, and with the full support of the Committee, until the return of the regular librarian in April of 1954. Before employing her as the regular librarian, September 1 of this year, the Jeanes Library Committee completely satisfied itself as to her loyalty. Mrs. Knowles has at all times cooperated fully with our Committee in such things as obtaining Government-issued transcripts of the Judiciary Committee's proceedings, etc. Her qualifications as a librarian are excellent, particularly in the area of services to the children of our community, and the Library Committee feels that it is indeed fortunate in obtaining so experienced, well recommended, and able a person.

We are aware of the fact that to have accepted someone else, perhaps less qualified but politically unquestioned, for the position would have presented fewer

problems, but it is a matter of deep conviction with us that to do so would have been an evasion of both responsibility and justice.

The following condensed quote from the Friends Committee on National Legislation perhaps expresses more clearly our position than we could ourselves:

"We regard the preservation of civil liberties as an integral part of our common responsibility as citizens. Moreover, we hold that individual liberty is precious in a free society, and that it should not be sacrificed (without due process of law). Our law presupposes certain basic rights of each person: the right to confront and cross-examine an accuser; the right to legal counsel; the assumption of innocence before the law until proven guilty; protection from guilt by association in the absence of proof of individual guilt; freedom to differ from the majority; and protection for the privacy of one's homes and one's conversation unless authorized by a particular warrant. These rights are today being violated by irresponsible accusations * * * and are being threatened by hysteria and prejudice. We condemn treason or spying or any disloyal act. At the same time we highly value free thought, free speech, and free association. We feel these latter to be essential to the elimination of error or wavering loyalty."

That a person as well qualified as Mrs. Knowles for the position of librarian should be denied her rightful role in the community for reasons no better than rumor, suspicion, prejudice, or fear would be to us, and we hope to you, a miscarriage of the basic ideals on which democracy is founded.

On the basis of evidence we have at hand we will continue to regard Mrs. Knowles as a loyal, concerned, and conscientious citizen.

The Library Committee would like to take this opportunity to thank the Commissioners for their support in the past, and to hope that their relationship to the Library may again be a satisfying one.

(Signed) MARY R. CHAPPLE
(For the Library Committee).
Mrs. PAUL TAPLEY, *Trustec.*
Mr. RAY RIDAY, *Trustee.*
Miss ALICE AMBLER.
Mr. JOHN ARCHIBALD.
Mrs. CHARLES CHAPPLE.

REPORT OF THE LIBRARY COMMITTEE

(October 1954)

Most of you are familiar with Mrs. Knowles' professional qualifications. Briefly they are as follows:

Beginning as a page, during her high school years in the Watertown, Mass. Library she worked there 15 years, becoming successively general assistant, Children's Librarian at their East Branch; and finally head of the Children's Department of the Watertown Library system which consists of a main library and four branches. This service dated from the year 1923 to 1938.

While she was at college and again during the early years of her role as a wife and mother she worked part time at the Bates College Library.

Taking up full-time employment again in 1945 she was a member of the office personnel of the Samuel Adams School for Social Science for 2½ years. From there she went, as librarian, in 1948 to the Morrill Memorial Library in Norwood, Mass., where she served for a period of nearly 5 years.

While at the Morrill Library (1948-53) she represented the library on the Norwood Board of the Boston Family Service Society. She was secretary-treasurer for 2 of these years of the Round Table of Librarians for Young Adults—a statewide organization affiliated with the Massachusetts State Library Association, and the American Library Association.

Mrs. Knowles was awarded a certificate on the basis of examination for professional competency as a librarian by the Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

From Norwood she came to Philadelphia and was referred to us by the librarian at the College of Physicians. Beginning in October of last year she was employed by us as a substitute during the illness of our regular librarian and served ably from October of 1953 to April 1954. Upon the retirement of our regular librarian, Mrs. Sawyer, on September 1st of this year, Mrs. Knowles was asked to fill the vacancy.

Appointment as librarian and retention after appointment require not only professional competence but involve the affirmative obligation of being diligent and loyal in citizenship.

Ordinarily this latter question would not come up in seeking a librarian for the Jeanes Library—but Mrs. Knowles' very honest and direct statements to us when she was first interviewed, to the effect that she had been accused of past membership in the Communist Party and that she holds a conviction, as a loyal American, that to take a required oath is not a meaningful demonstration of good citizenship—places upon the committee employing her the need to establish beyond doubt her qualifications.

We are satisfied that Mrs. Knowles meets the requirements of citizenship, professional competence, and character—and that having fully met these standards is entitled to the confidence and protection of the Committee.

We have read the testimony of Herbert Philbrick, a worker in the Cambridge Youth Council, who volunteered his services to the FBI as an undercover agent in the Boston area. He named in his report many people associated with the Samuel Adams School for Social Sciences. Among them were Dr. Harley of Simmons University and Professor Struik of MIT. In the records of the Velde Committee (of the House) and the Jenner Committee (of the Senate) we found no one connected with the school who had not availed themselves of the protection of the Fifth Amendment.

The Association of American Universities issued a statement pertinent to these hearings and though Dr. Harley was listed as Director of the School (during Mrs. Knowles' employment there) and Dr. Struik was listed as a member of the faculty—both were retained by Simmons and MIT, respectively—and are at present so employed.

In connection with this hearing we note that Senator Welker stated in open session that "once you open up the subject matter you are not permitted to call a stopping point in your testimony (by invoking the Fifth Amendment)."

This ruling led many of those who had not invoked the Fifth Amendment into a position of having to name associates—understandably a thing some of them were reluctant to do. Whether this influenced Mrs. Knowles' decision we cannot state as a fact. We believe it did.

Philbrick's testimony to the Senate Judiciary Committee was given in 1953, between 5 and 6 years after Mrs. Knowles had left the Samuel Adams School to become librarian at the Morrill Memorial Library at Norwood. In his testimony to the House Un-American Activities Committee in 1951 he did not mention Mrs. Knowles; in 1953 he said, in executive session, that she had been a party member in about 1945-47.

As to loyalty oaths, Herbert Philbrick offered the following testimony to the Senate Judiciary Committee on April 7, 1953 (Mary Knowles appeared May 21, 1953):

"When the question came up in Massachusetts about the teachers' oath law * * * Communist Party members publicly, of course, carried on a great campaign against the teachers' oath law, saying this was going to kill academic freedom * * * but inside cell meetings they were told to sign the oath and, in fact, to be the first to sign the oath, and that is actually what happened" (p. 765, pt. 7).

"I think the evidence will prove that the Communist Party members did, in fact, follow those instructions and that everyone of them signed the oath because the oath meant nothing to them" (p. 765, pt. 7 "Subversive Influences in the Education Process," Committee on the Judiciary).

The following are statements from letters in our files of people who were thoroughly familiar with Mrs. Knowles' immediate background and who, of course, knew her personally.

I. To Miss Ambler (Secretary of the Jeanes Library Committee) from Henry J. Cadbury, Chairman of the American Friends Service Committee and Professor Emeritus of Theology at Harvard University, October 1953:

"I think there is every reason for you to expect the best of Mrs. Mary Knowles. Her alertness, her easy approach to people, her skill in librarianship * * * make her a person too good not to be well employed."

"Edna Phillips who has worked intimately with her has never detected any hint of dishonesty or even secrecy in all other matters. If you escape the bogey of a distant past and her use of the Fifth Amendment (my guess is that she was defending others rather than herself) you will have secured I think a very competent worker."

II. To Miss Ambler from Edna Phillips, Librarian at Morrill Memorial Library, Norwood, Mass., October 1953:

"During nearly 5 years (1948-53) Mrs. Knowles' record with us was excellent. (I heard of her through the Massachusetts Division of Library Extension, and had high commendation of her from her former chief, the Librarian of the Watertown, Mass., Public Library.)

"I have found her, in her life and work with us, very intelligent, well-read, capable, and unusually considerate of others—both our readers and her fellow staff members. She is gifted in her work with young people and has a fine sense of humor * * * I can heartily recommend her for the position you mention."

III. To Miss Ambler from Hannah Severns, Librarian, Moorestown Free Library, Moorestown, N. J., May 4, 1954:

"It is with real disappointment and regret that I feel I would like to write you of the decision of our Library Board in regard to the nonappointment of Mary Knowles.

"In fairness to each individual member, I feel the Board has given deep consideration to the problem involved. None of us, with the exception of one member, feels satisfied with the decision, I am sure.

"Mary Knowles is coming out tonight * * * and I feel after talking with her last Sunday that her understanding and acceptance of our decision is another evidence of her rare spirit and magnanimity. I am still hoping that some library will be big enough to recognize the outstanding qualifications of Mary Knowles, and that we ourselves may some day be big enough and fortunate enough to have such a person as Mary Knowles as a member of our staff."

Although the taking of a loyalty oath is not required of our librarian, either by the Committee or by the State of Pennsylvania—Mary Knowles made the following statement as to her personal convictions pertaining to such an oath; and although the Library Committee does not necessarily share her views on this we defend her right to such a conviction:

"I have been aware of the need to offer prospective employers some degree of assurance as to my present status, in fact I have felt it necessary to do so. If you will recall, in October when I first met with the Committee, I told them that since leaving the Samuel Adams School I have had no connection formal or otherwise, with any so-called leftwing or "subversive" organization, and that I do indeed uphold the Constitution of the United States and the Declaration of Independence. When I met with you last week I again offered this. I would like to submit to the Committee, in writing, the same statement, voluntarily and freely given.

"On the matter of loyalty to the United States, I believe it is one of the responsibilities of a mature citizen to be actively aware of and engaged in the demonstration of such loyalty at all times. I think the imposition of a loyalty oath robs a citizen of such responsibility, and weakens the need for active participation on the part of the individual.

"Further, I find that conscientiously and consistently I cannot sign an oath which I believe to be at variance with the very documents I do uphold, the Constitution and the Declaration of Independence. I am also extremely reluctant to be a means of introducing to an institution, and thereby extending the scope of, a measure, namely the Loyalty Oath, which does not apply under State laws to that institution, whether or not such a procedure would be used only in this instance.

"I do want to express to the Committee my appreciation of their understanding and their willingness to explore the possibilities in this situation; and of their warm support and confidence in my work during the past 3 months. I feel privileged to have had the opportunity to work with the Committee, and have had great pleasure in becoming acquainted with people in the community and in the thought that I may have been able to be of some service to them."

Enclosed in that letter was the following statement:

"I believe firmly in the United States of America and in the documents upon which it is founded, the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution of the United States, and do support, obey and defend them. I do also support the constitution of the State of Pennsylvania.

"Since leaving the Samuel Adams School I have had no connection, formal or otherwise, with any so-called leftwing or 'subversive' organization" (February 3, 1954).

For the further assurance of the Library Committee, she also made a notarized statement as follows:

"Mary Knowles, being duly sworn according to law deposes and says that she is not a Communist or a member of any subversive organization."

COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA,

County of Delaware.

Sworn to and subscribed before me this 22d day of September 1954.

C. I. PARKS, *Notary Public.*

In summary, the issues with which the Committee has been confronted and the conclusions which it has reached are these:

1. Should an accusation of past membership in the Communist Party be disqualification for employment? We think it should not. An individual is entitled to be judged by what he is now, not by what he has been in the past. If accusations of past membership in the Party make existence difficult, persons will be discouraged from leaving the Party; we prefer that they be encouraged to leave.

2. Is it a disqualification for employment if a loyalty oath is declined? We think not. A loyalty oath is a fixed form, a doubtful means at best of ascertaining loyalty, and there are some who find it impossible for conscientious reasons to take such an oath. We respect the right of a person to hold such a view whether we agree with it or not. The pertinent evidence must be weighed; the form of the evidence is immaterial.

3. Should a plea of the Fifth Amendment give rise to unfavorable inferences? We think not. The Fifth Amendment reflects the great principle that every man is innocent until proved guilty; it states the constitutional right of every citizen not to give evidence which might incriminate him. If from his silence an unfavorable inference is drawn—that is, if one assumes from that fact that he is guilty—the spirit of the amendment is violated just as much as if he were compelled to answer. The Fifth Amendment presupposes, and we know, that there are valid reasons for an innocent person's declining to give evidence; we think it a mistake to assume in any case that an answer is declined for a bad reason.

In employing Mrs. Knowles we have recognized that a careful inquiry into her present views would be wise. We have made that inquiry. It has seemed proper to us that she should be judged for what she is, not for what she may have been. In estimating her we have tried to set aside vague suspicion and to apply fair standards rather than arbitrary tests. In our view Mrs. Knowles meets those standards beyond question.

As small a pinpoint as Plymouth Meeting is on the map of these United States, and as minute an issue as this appears to be in the overall support of Democracy itself * * * your Library Committee feels it to be an opportunity to demonstrate the faith of this community in the validity of a Democracy in which individual freedom and the general welfare are safe from violation, infringement and exploitation.

We are deeply disturbed at the increasing encroachments on the freedom and integrity of the individual by irresponsible accusations, by pressures for conformity in thinking, by charges of guilt by association, rather than the presumption of innocence. All of these have their origin in fear and insecurity. Such practices strike at the root of American political philosophy.

"There is a line—sometimes difficult to identify but always a vital demarcation—between punishing for individual acts of subversion and punishing for adherence to political sentiments. Up to now, the American machinery for justice has operated on the premise that an individual can and should be punished for committing specific wrongs, but not solely for holding an opinion that is heretical to our concept of democracy. Stealing State secrets, conspiring to advocate the forceful overthrow of Government or encouraging sabotage are included in the category of specific, punishable wrongs. Indicating an interest in Marxist philosophy or holding a membership card in the Communist Party have not been so included" (Time Magazine, September 27, 1954, quoting from the Providence Journal-Bulletin).

Submitted by the Library Committee, William Jeanes Memorial Library, Plymouth Monthly Meeting of Friends.

PUBLIC STATEMENT OF THE LIBRARY COMMITTEE OF PLYMOUTH MONTHLY MEETING

MARCH 7, 1955.

To the Editor of the Ambler Gazette, Mr. William E. Strasburg:

DEAR MR. STRASBURG: You have asked the Committee of the William Jeanes Library to restate its beliefs and policies on employing Mrs. Mary Knowles. The Committee feels a great responsibility to all our neighbors who live in and around our community and who use and enjoy the William Jeanes Library.

There are involved in this appointment principles which we hold most precious as members of the Religious Society of Friends, as well as citizens of the United States.

Before we employed Mrs. Knowles we discussed her background, beliefs and associations, with her and investigated them fully by other means. We were aware of her use of the Fifth Amendment. We were aware of an accusation of past association with the Communist Party. These things sharpened our inquiry. Despite that we found Mrs. Knowles thoroughly competent and were fully satisfied as to her trustworthiness and loyalty to her country. If at any time evidence is presented to the contrary, Mrs. Knowles is here working every day in Plymouth Meeting and is available to the already informed officials.

There has arisen no question about her ability. We have never had a better library service. Other issues with which we have been confronted are these:

Should an accusation of association with the Communist Party 8 years ago be disqualification for employment? We think it should not. Certainly, in a Christian and democratic nation, the individual has a right to be judged on the merits of his particular case. If he is a person of evident character and there is nothing to indicate any recent association with the Communist Party, it would be a denial of the very ideals on which our form of government is founded, to so disqualify him.

Is it a disqualification for employment if a loyalty oath is declined? Loyalty is a fact which goes beyond any particular form of words. The State does not require a loyalty oath of Mrs. Knowles. As Friends we have not, and shall not require an oath of her, believing that truth is no stronger under oath.

Should a plea of the Fifth Amendment give rise to unfavorable inferences? We think not. The right to be silent (Fifth Amendment) is equal to the right of free speech, free press and freedom of religion (First Amendment). These rights must be respected for all persons or they are endangered for each of us.

Finally it is suggested that one who does not cooperate with a Congressional Committee should be penalized by exclusion from employment in his chosen field. But, when silence is the exercise of a constitutional right, to penalize that silence would jeopardize that constitutional right. We think it impossible, in the name of the defense of democracy to penalize in any way the exercise of rights guaranteed by our Constitution. Such rights, however unpopular, must be available without penalty to all, or they will mean nothing to any of us.

Few persons today are in a situation more uncomfortable than one accused, rightly or not, of association with the Communist Party. However casual the connection, whatever the motive, no matter what he may do to purge himself, he remains, for many suspect. No situation requires more Christian forbearance and understanding. These we have tried to employ.

The Library Committee would like to express its gratitude to the community for the intelligent consideration, good will and faith extended us in this matter. That we have not made ourselves understood everywhere is inevitable, but from these principles we cannot in conscience turn aside.

The Library Committee of the William Jeanes Memorial Library
(Plymouth Meeting, Pa.):

Mrs. PAUL TAPLEY, *Chairman*.
Mr. JOHN ARCHIBALD.
Miss ALICE AMBLER.
Mrs. CHARLES CHAPPEL. (sic)
Mr. RAY RIDAY.

A STATEMENT CONCERNING CIVIL LIBERTIES

Adopted By The Abington Quarterly Meetings Of Friends Held Fifth Month 7, 1953.

During the past 300 years the Religious Society of Friends (commonly called Quakers) has frequently felt called upon to give expression to ideas and to perform acts that have gone counter to prevailing opinion. These meetings, composed of some 2,300 Friends in northern Philadelphia and lower Montgomery and Bucks Counties, find themselves at this time impelled to make public protest against a practice and an attitude that are coming to be acceptable to more and more of our fellow citizens. The practice we refer to is the attempt to investigate and to test loyalty by various State and Federal bodies. The attitude is the commonly held belief that such testing is a necessary part of our fight against Communism.

Though we are aware that in so doing we lay ourselves open to a charge of being impractical and unrealistic, yet we affirm that perfect love does indeed cast out fear and that only through the power of love can trust and understanding be fostered between neighbors, as between governments. Further, it seems to us clear that loyalty can never be enforced. Only when our institutions, through their integrity to their highest ideals and through honest practice of their principles shall have deserved it, will they obtain the loyalty of freemen.

We see a need—and find it difficult to understand why others do not see this need so clearly—for all men to be allowed to speak what they conceive to be the truth, even when we abhor the purpose and meaning of such expression. We regret the tendency, which seems to be growing, to set neighbor against neighbor because of differences of opinion. Such differences, it is clear to us, are the lifeblood of our communities, and they should be freely and fearlessly expressed.

As Friends, we attempt to practice our belief that "There is that of God in every man." As citizens of the United States we are strongly attached to our belief that honest opinions honestly arrived at must be heard. We are deeply troubled by the growing threats to these beliefs.

THOMAS L. KNIGHT,
THOMAS S. AMBLER,

Clerks.

Coulter Street Meeting House
47 W. Coulter Street
Germantown, Philadelphia

A QUERY AND ADVICES ADDRESSED TO FRIENDS ON CIVIL LIBERTIES

- Prepared by a called meeting of Friends at Scattergood School in Iowa on the 2nd to 4th of Fourth Month, 1954.

"I BELIEVED THAT LIBERTY WAS THE NATURAL RIGHT OF ALL MEN EQUALLY." — John Woolman

"IF THEY KEEP TO TRUTH, THEY CAN NEITHER TAKE ANY OATHS NOR PUT ANY OATHS TO ANYONE." — George Fox

"HE THAT FEARS UNTRUTH NEED NOT SWEAR, BECAUSE HE WILL NOT LIE... AND HE THAT DOTH NOT FEAR UNTRUTH, WHAT IS HIS OATH WORTH?" — William Penn

"WE UTTERLY DENY ALL OUTWARD WARS AND STRIFE, AND FIGHTINGS WITH OUTWARD WEAPONS, FOR ANY END, OR UNDER ANY PRETENCE WHATSOEVER; THIS IS OUR TESTIMONY TO THE WHOLE WORLD.

"THAT SPIRIT OF CHRIST BY WHICH WE ARE GUIDED, IS NOT CHANGEABLE, SO AS ONCE TO COMMAND US FROM A THING AS EVIL, AND AGAIN TO MOVE US UNTO IT.

"FOR THIS WE CAN SAY TO ALL THE WORLD, WE HAVE WRONGED NO MAN'S PERSON OR POSSESSIONS, WE HAVE USED NO FORCE NOR VIOLENCE AGAINST ANY MAN, WE HAVE BEEN FOUND IN NO PLOTS, NOR GUILTY OF SEDITION; WHEN WE HAVE BEEN WRONGED, WE HAVE NOT SOUGHT TO REVENGE OURSELVES, WE HAVE NOT MADE RESISTANCE AGAINST AUTHORITY; BUT WHEREIN WE COULD NOT OBEY FOR CONSCIENCE-SAKE, WE HAVE SUFFERED... AND THE CAUSE OF ALL THIS OUR SUFFERING, IS NOT FOR ANY EVIL, BUT FOR THE THINGS RELATING TO THE WORSHIP OF OUR GOD, AND IN OBEDIENCE TO HIS REQUIREMENTS OF US. — A Declaration from the people called Quakers presented to Charles II, upon the 21st day of Eleventh Month, 1660.

RELIGIOUS FAITH AND CIVIL LIBERTIES

From its beginnings 300 years ago the Religious Society of Friends has opposed the use of force or violence between individuals or nations. Because we believe in conciliation, based on respect and love for all peoples, it is equally impossible for us to advocate the overthrow of any government by force and violence, or to support the war-making effort of any government. Our belief in that of God in every man, and in the essential sacredness of the individual, is unalterably opposed to the totalitarian way of life and its resultant totalitarian state.

Moreover, our nation is "this nation under God" and we reaffirm our unshaken conviction that our highest allegiance is to God. If there is a conflict "we ought to obey God rather than men".

American democracy was founded on a deep religious faith in the ultimate worth of man; a faith that man has rights and responsibilities given by God; that free men will seek truth and right and will choose them rather than error; that men need not fear "to follow truth wherever it may lead, nor to tolerate error so long as reason is left free to combat it". The founders believed that a government whose power to interfere with personal liberty is limited, is safer and better than one which prescribes conformity to any orthodox doctrine. We affirm our agreement with these principles.

Today in a time of great social and political tension many Americans are losing touch with the ideals and sources of strength upon which this democracy rests. In response to the fears and hates of war, in fear even of their own weapons of war, they are losing faith in man and his relation to God; they are losing faith in the power of ideas freely arrived at to meet and displace error. They are losing touch with the needs and aspirations of people in most of the rest of the world. Indeed, in their fear of Communism, they are losing faith in democracy.

Civil liberties are founded on God's gift to man of the ability to search for truth and the freedom to act on what truth he finds. This freedom can only be fully expressed in the social group and it should be to maintain the conditions most favorable to man's exercise of his God-given rights that governments exist. A government which carries out this responsibility well is, as William Penn said, "a part of religion itself, a thing sacred in its institutions and end."

If we remember that God and not the state is the source of the truth men seek, then any attempt on the part of government to determine what men may or may not believe, may or may not say, will be recognized as a perversion of the government's function.

The threat of Communism has caused us to forget these eternal truths. Yet, Communism jeopardizes our way of life not so much by its political and economic theories as by those totalitarian practices which destroy moral fiber, erase human conscience and abolish human freedom. A democratic government which attempts to protect itself against Communism by adopting totalitarian measures is thereby succumbing to the most destructive element in what it fears. No amount of international tension, intrigue, or threat of war can justify measures which are undemocratic.

Increasing encroachments on the freedom and integrity of the individual by irresponsible accusations, by pressures for conformity in thinking, by charges of guilt by association, by insistence on assertions of loyalty, and by the assumption of guilt, rather than the presumption of innocence, all have their origin in fear and insecurity, growing in large part out of the threat of war and of Communism and out of the emphasis on military strength and military secrecy. These are essential features of totalitarianism. They create an image of the state as the source of all truth and the object of unqualified loyalty. This is idolatry, and strikes at the root of both American political philosophy and of basic Quaker principle.

A QUERY

Do Friends and Friends' meetings seek faithfully to uphold our civil and religious liberties, not only for ourselves but for all men?

ADVICES TO FRIENDS

In the light of these, our ancient Truths, Friends are advised:

1. To reaffirm their faith in the living God whose spirit works in the hearts of all men and to recognize that God works to preserve the rights and liberties of men as He works through them; and also to examine once more the underlying principles of our democracy.

2. Since the fear of controversy often impedes us in the pursuit of truth, Friends are advised to welcome controversy when it arises from differing opinions honestly held. We should aim to develop a corporate witness on freedom which will match the clarity of our other testimonies. Through the creative use of controversy we can discover new truth.

3. Friends are urged to be alert to dangers inherent in censorship, and in conditions which would limit the freedom of teachers to discuss current problems, and in movements which would seek to enforce a narrow orthodoxy of thought and expression.

Since freedom of expression has no meaning unless there is a place where people can express their views, Friends are specifically encouraged to provide facilities for the serious discussion of important, controversial issues in an atmosphere of creative goodwill.

4. The influence of each individual in the local community is of great importance. Monthly Meetings should encourage members to be alert and faithful in their witness to Truth, providing for group action when indicated. Yearly Meetings or national committees on civil liberties, peace or other matters can never succeed unless the ground is prepared in the home communities. It is hoped that Friends' publications and organizations will give special attention to problems of civil liberties during the critical period ahead.

5. Friends should continue their efforts:

To secure equal treatment for all conscientious objectors to military service, whether on religious or other grounds;

To change the law and the regulations to provide more favorable treatment for those with conscientious scruples against registration for compulsory military service;

To seek redress in the courts for violation of these rights by government in order to establish more firmly the legal rights of conscience and to curb abuses in the administration of these laws.

Friends generally should support individuals who have suffered loss of their livelihood by acting under conscience in resisting conscription, or in opposing loyalty oaths, or for seeking to uphold basic civil and religious liberties.

6. Friends should deal with Communists, individuals accused of Communism, or persons rejected by society for other reasons, as human beings. Without embracing false philosophies or condoning any error, Friends should still regard all people as children of God. If in prison they should be visited; and where there is need, arrangements made for their families.

7. In the face of increasing pressure toward conformity as exemplified in non-disloyalty oaths, Friends should re-examine their traditional testimony against

oaths which test loyalty by words instead of deeds, intensely fear and suspicion, and imply guilt unless innocence is proven, not to mention implying a double standard of truth. True loyalty and allegiance can be attained only by conviction, not by coercion. In the words of the Five Years Meeting of Friends in 1945, we affirm "our unchanging conviction that our first allegiance is to God and if this conflicts with any compulsion by the state we serve our country best by remaining true to our higher loyalty."

8. Friends are encouraged to exercise the responsibility of citizenship by examining carefully specific national issues affecting civil liberties and civil rights and by taking action as appropriate. We view with apprehension: the lack of protection of individual rights in some Congressional Committee procedures; the current proposals to permit wiretapping; the operation of the Federal Loyalty-Security program; the investigation of beliefs and associations by the Federal Bureau of Investigation; and the limitations placed on the issuance of passports and visas with adverse effect, among other things, on the holding of scientific and religious conferences in this country, as well as the free travel of American citizens abroad. We encourage programs of education and legislation to remove racial and religious discrimination and to guarantee equal opportunities and rights to all citizens. We advocate support of the International Declaration of Human Rights.

9. In making statements to investigating officers and agencies, Friends should be especially careful for the reputation of others, speaking only the objective facts known to them, and guarding against misquotation by making statements in writing where possible.

10. Finally, Friends are reminded that the loss of civil liberties is an inevitable consequence of the resort to war and violence as the means of security. They have, therefore, an inescapable responsibility to work unceasingly for the elimination of war through the establishment of a just economic and political order, disarmament and the creation of true world community.

WITH A PROFOUND SENSE OF HUMILITY THAT WE HAVE FALLEN SO FAR SHORT OF THE IDEAL REVEALED IN THE LIGHT GIVEN UNTO US, AND WITH A CORRESPONDING SENSE OF RESPONSIBILITY TO OUR FELLOW MEN WE CALL ON ALL FRIENDS TO JOIN WITH US IN THE PURSUIT OF THESE GOALS.

(A conference on Civil Liberties was called by the Friends World Committee, at the suggestion of Pacific Yearly Meeting. 57 Friends were present representing 20 Yearly Meetings, The American Friends Service Committee, the Friends Committee on National Legislation, the Friends World Committee, and the Lake Erie Association. This statement was issued by them to all Friends.)

Copies are available free from:

FRIENDS WORLD COMMITTEE
American Section and Fellowship Council
20 South Twelfth Street
Philadelphia 7, Pennsylvania

STATEMENT ON CIVIL LIBERTIES ADOPTED BY THE PHILADELPHIA YEARLY MEETINGS, 3/27, 1954

The Religious Society of Friends arose in days of conflict and persecution three hundred years ago. Today the complex problems of national security and the preservation of individual liberty present an issue of vital concern to all of us. Our belief in the infinite worth of the individual human being and in "that of God in every man" carries with it a corresponding responsibility to society as a whole.

We are deeply disturbed at the increasing encroachments on the freedom and integrity of the individual by irresponsible accusations, by pressures for conformity in thinking, by charges of guilt by association, by insistence on assertions of loyalty, and by the assumption of guilt, rather than the presumption of innocence. All of these have their origin in fear and insecurity. Such practices strike at the root of both American political philosophy and Friends' basic concept of man's relationship to God.

We must reaffirm our belief in man's integrity; we must reawaken in our fellow men a real faith in their spiritual nature. We appeal to all men to build with Divine Guidance a democracy in which individual freedom and the general welfare are safe from violation, infringement and exploitation.

A STATEMENT ON CIVIL LIBERTIES ISSUED BY THE REPRESENTATIVE MEETING OF PHILADELPHIA YEARLY MEETING OF THE RELIGIOUS SOCIETY OF FRIENDS

To the Monthly Meetings:

The Representative Meeting, which was originally constituted as a Meeting for Sufferings to help Friends and others who were suffering from persecution by protecting their legal rights, appealing to authorities and promoting remedial legislation is again concerned with the protection of civil liberties. Since civil liberties have been a primary concern of the Society of Friends from its beginning we believe it is useful for us to review from time to time our testimony on this subject, especially at present when our thinking requires clarification because we are confronted with this old issue in a new and more threatening form.

One aspect of this concern as presented to us today is not new. Friends have throughout their history been concerned with upholding the civil rights of the Negro as a human being entitled to the same privileges and opportunities as other races. Our position on this question is clear and needs no further clarification at this time though some will want to bring about a quick change for the better through the enforcement of law and others will favor more gradual changes as being more likely to succeed.

Our book of Faith and Practice (1955) quoting from a statement adopted in 1934 by both Philadelphia Yearly Meetings, states (p. 38) "that very individual of every race and nation is of supreme worth; that love is the highest law of life, and that evil is to be overcome, not by further evil, but by good.* * * We believe in those principles, not as mere ideals for some future time, but as part of the eternal moral order and as a way of life to be lived here and now.* * * We affirm the supremacy of conscience. We recognize the privileges and obligations of citizenship; but we reject as false that philosophy which sets the state above the moral law and demands from the individual unquestioning obedience to every state command. On the contrary we assert that every individual, while owing loyalty to the state, owes a more binding loyalty to a higher authority—the authority of God and conscience."

In accordance with these principles we are concerned by the threat to civil liberties today due to the fear caused by the rise of Communism as a world power. In order to check the growth of Communism, methods have been used which endanger our freedom and create in our country an atmosphere of suspicion and mistrust. As Friends we strongly oppose Communism because, for one reason, it uses these same methods to produce uniformity of thought and action. A beginning has been made in the use of these methods in America which may be an entering wedge to a much greater effort.

Friends in the past have made great sacrifices on behalf of civil and religious liberty, especially during the early years of Quaker history when governments both in England and America sought to produce uniformity by the suppression of minorities. As Friends were the most radical of these minorities they aroused the most opposition and the most persecution. Friends suffered severely because of their disobedience to a law prohibiting attendance at a Friends

meeting, because of their refusal to pay tithes to the established church, and because of their refusal to take an oath. This oath included a statement of belief aimed primarily at Catholics. In this respect, it was similar to the loyalty oath today directed against Communists. Because of this refusal Friends were sometimes confused with those against whom the oath was directed just as they are today. Friends objected to the oath not only because of Christ's command against swearing but also because of its futility, its temptation to dishonesty, and its recognition of a double standard of truth. In the American Revolutionary and Civil Wars, Friends refused to take the test oaths although affirmation instead of swearing was allowed. In their refusal to submit to conscription for military service they held to their principle that they must obey God rather than man. Friends when brought before the courts did not hesitate to take advantage of every possible means provided by law for their protection. This included in a number of cases the exercise of the legal right to refuse to answer questions which might incriminate them, a right much older than the Fifth Amendment.

The Society of Friends played an important part in the long struggle for religious and civil liberty. For example, the philosopher, Whitehead, writes, "The apostles of modern tolerance, insofar as it exists, are Erasmus, the Quakers, and John Locke." (*Adventures of Ideas*, p. 63.) The Charter granted by Penn to Pennsylvania declared "no person or persons * * * shall be in any case molested or prejudiced in his or their person or estate because of his or their conscientious persuasion or practice."

In carrying forward this concern for civil liberty today we should remain faithful to our past inheritance. The following rights are among those which should be defended and extended:

(1) Every man has a right to believe whatever he thinks is true. The Constitution guarantees freedom of belief and freedom of conscience. A man should not be convicted because of his beliefs but only because of illegal actions. Membership in an organization of any kind should not determine guilt. We do not recognize guilt by association.

(2) The right to employment should be based solely on fitness for the job and not on past beliefs, actions, or associations. Men can and do change quite radically and this possibility should always be taken into consideration.

(3) The exercise of the privilege against self-incrimination, as allowed by the Fifth Amendment, is no evidence of guilt. Witnesses, whether guilty or not guilty of a crime, may exercise this privilege in order to avoid being convicted of contempt of Congress when they refuse to answer certain questions before Congressional investigating committees. Accordingly, the right to employment should not be abridged simply because of an appeal to the Fifth Amendment. This position was recently taken by the American Association of University Professors, and also by the Supreme Court of the United States in the *Harry Slochower* case on Fourth month 9, 1956.

(4) Friends should uphold those who cannot conscientiously testify to the political beliefs and associations of others.

(5) Persons who have not been convicted of any guilty action or who may even be guilty only of being liberal or internationally minded or who may, quite innocently, have been associated with groups or persons suspected of being subversive, sometimes suffer severe hardship because of vague suspicions that they are sympathetic with Communism. While public opinion in this respect appears to be improving we must continually remain alert and do whatever is possible to create in our country a feeling of mutual trust and confidence without which successful democracy is impossible.

Because of the nature of our method of opposing Communism we may be unfairly accused of being passive and inactive in the struggle for personal freedom and the recognition of the supreme value of the individual as compared with that of the state. But as Paul says, "The weapons of our warfare are not carnal." We believe that falsehood can be fought only with truth, that hatred can be vanquished only by love, and that evil can be overcome only by good. The use of force whether under law or in war is not, as history shows, successful in the conflict with ideas.

It is pointed out by those in favor of what is sometimes called "the free-enterprise system" that it is only in an atmosphere of freedom that new and creative ideas can develop. A society dominated by the fear of being different from generally accepted beliefs and standards of behavior is a dead, static society. Friends have frequently dared to be unconventional and so have become pioneers in many social reforms. The pressure exerted in America today toward mass-

mindedness and conformity must be resisted by those who remain faithful to our American ideal of civil liberty, a religious inheritance which found its first great expression in Penn's Holy Experiment. For the Society of Friends this ideal is based on our conviction that in every man there is a divine Source of Truth.

Fourth month 20, 1956.

INDEX

INDIVIDUALS

Page

Ambler, Alice	5464, 5500, 5502, 5503, 5526-5528,	5530
Ambler, Thomas L		5531
Archibald, John	5463, 5464, 5511, 5513, 5514, 5526,	5530
Beatty		5519
Bennett, Richard		5463
Black, Maureen. (See Ogden, Maureen.)		
Bregy, Philip	5463,	5464
Brodwick, Ray		5498
Browning, Helen	5488, 5498, 5513, 5516,	5517
Cadbury, Henry J		5527
Chapple, Mary (Mrs. Charles Chapple)	5464,	
	5465, 5472, 5473, 5482, 5495, 5499, 5517, 5518, 5521, 5526,	5530
Cooper, Mrs.	5465,	5467
Corson, Carroll	5481-5483, 5505, 5509,	5512
Corson, George C	5469, 5486, 5503-5510 (testimony),	5512, 5513
Corson, Mrs. Philip L	5464-5467, 5469, 5471, 5474, 5478, 5481, 5502,	5514
Crawford, Emily Livezey	5510-5514 (testimony)	
Evans		5463
Freeman, David F	5459, 5460,	5463
Gloeckner, Fred		5463, 5465
Gloeckner, Louise (Mrs. Fred Gloeckner)		5464, 5513
Harley (Harrison)		5527
Hemsley, Henry	5467, 5488, 5494-5503 (testimony),	5513, 5516, 5517, 5521
Hutchins, Robert		5481, 5482
Jeanes, William		5470, 5504
Jones, Frank J. C	5490, 5491,	5505
Kirkpatrick (Dr.)		5495
Knight, Thomas L		5531
Knowles, Mary	5460, 5462,	
	5464-5492, 5495-5503, 5505-5509, 5511-5514, 5517-5521, 5524-5530	
Linton, M. Albert		5463, 5465
Loescher, Frank		5463
Miller, Mary R. (Mrs. William Jeanes)	5484, 5504,	5505
Ogden, Maureen (nee Black)	5457-5483 (testimony),	5485, 5506, 5521, 5522
Parks, C. I		5529
Philbrick, Herbert A	5462, 5478, 5490,	5527
Phillips, Edna		5527, 5528
Poley, Irvin		5463
Riday, Ray	5496, 5516, 5526,	5530
Sawyer, Edith		5465, 5467,
	5479, 5480, 5485-5487, 5495, 5496, 5503, 5504, 5519, 5520,	5526
Severns, Hannah		5528
Sheppard, Isaac I	5465, 5467, 5480, 5484-	
	5493 (testimony), 5496, 5497, 5504, 5512, 5513, 5516, 5517,	5521
Sheppard, Lewis	5488, 5495, 5496, 5498, 5501, 5513, 5516,	5517
Sherron, Martha		5507, 5512
Shoemaker, Edith C	5472, 5473, 5506,	5510, 5512
Sprogell, Harry E	5460, 5461, 5463, 5464,	
	5467, 5468, 5472, 5474-5479, 5499, 5500, 5505, 5506,	5521, 5522
Stevenson, Mrs. William E		5458
Strasburg, William E		5530
Struik (Dirk Jung)		5527

	Page
Tapley, Lillian P. (Mrs. Paul Tapley)-----	5464, 5465, 5472, 5486-5489, 5495, 5497, 5500-5502, 5507, 5511, 5514-5524 (testimony), 5524-5536 (statement)
Webster, Bethuel M.-----	5457
White, Gilbert-----	5482

ORGANIZATIONS

Americans Alerted-----	5462, 5464, 5479
American Friends Service Committee. (See Religious Society of Friends.)	
American Legion (Casey-Sheppard Post 895)-----	5485, 5500
Daughters of the American Revolution (DAR)-----	5522
Valley Forge Chapter-----	5500
Ford Foundation-----	5460
Friends Committee on National Legislation. (See Religious Society of Friends, Committee on National Legislation.)	
Friends of the Jeanes Library Association-----	5461, 5462
Friends World Committee. (See Religious Society of Friends.)	
Fund for the Republic, Inc.-----	5457-5536
Germantown Friends School-----	5463
Jenner Committee. (See United States Government, Senate Internal Security Subcommittee.)	
Massachusetts Institute of Technology (MIT)-----	5527
Moorestown Free Library-----	5528
Morrill Memorial Library (Norwood, Mass.)-----	5518, 5520, 5526, 5528
Norwood Library. (See Morrill Memorial Library.)	
Plymouth Monthly Meeting. (See Religious Society of Friends.)	
Religious Society of Friends-----	5484, 5489, 5531
Abington Quarterly Meeting of Friends-----	5525, 5531
American Friends Service Committee-----	5463, 5527, 5533
Committee on National Legislation-----	5526, 5533
Friends World Committee-----	5533
Lake Erie Association-----	5533
Pacific Yearly Meeting-----	5533
Philadelphia Yearly Meeting-----	5461, 5525, 5534
Plymouth Monthly Meeting-----	5457-5536
Samuel Adams School-----	5462, 5478, 5485, 5518-5520, 5526, 5527
Simmons University-----	5527
United States Government, Senate Internal Security Subcommittee-----	5462, 5475-5477, 5480, 5518
Veterans of Foreign Wars-----	5522
William Jeanes Memorial Library-----	5460, 5484, 5491, 5492, 5498, 5499, 5515, 5525
Library Committee-----	5462, 5464, 5467, 5470, 5473-5475, 5478, 5484-5491, 5494-5500, 5503, 5507, 5508, 5511-5521, 5524-5530

PUBLICATIONS

Ambler Gazette-----	5466, 5525, 5530
Conshohocken Recorder-----	5464-5466
Norristown Times Herald-----	5525







3 9999 05706 3248

a	3249	infil sect pt 6
b c d	3240	blacklisting pgs 1-3
e m	3241	protestant pgs 2-3
f	3242	fund for republic
g	3243	Tillich
h i	3244	New Haven pt 1-2
j	3245	LA oct 11
k	3246	submission diplo
l	3247	Youngstown near

